

The Case of the Manchester Educationists.

A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE

A COMMITTEE

OF

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF

Education in Manchester and Salford.

BY JOHN HOWARD HINTON, M.A.

PREPARED AND PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A COMMITTEE FORMED
IN LONDON FOR OPPOSING THE MANCHESTER EDUCATION BILLS.

LONDON:

JOHN SNOW, 35, PATERNOSTER ROW.

SOLD ALSO BY FLETCHER AND TUBBS, MANCHESTER.

1852.

LONDON :

J. HADDON AND SON, PRINTERS, CASTLE STREET, FINSEBURY.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Introduction	1

PART I.—THE GROUNDS OF THE LOCAL SCHEME.

CHAP. I. The local scheme primarily eleemosynary	4
II. School accommodation	5
III. School attendance	6
IV. Explanations	10
V. Evening schools	16
VI. Sunday schools	19
VII. Proving too much	22
VIII. Manchester in 1834 and 1852	24
IX. Manchester compared with other towns	28
X. Poverty in Manchester	29
XI. The same subject continued	38
XII. Mr. Richson's system of poor relief	42
XIII. School support	45
XIV. The voluntary system	51
XV. The same subject continued	60
XVI. A school rate compared with common rates	64
XVII. The cost of pauperism and crime	65
XVIII. The right of society	68
XIX. The petitions	69

PART II.—THE DETAILS OF THE LOCAL BILL.

	Page.
CHAP. I. The Bill superfluous, costly, unjust, uncharitable, and injurious	72
II. The Bill destructive to educational effects on the voluntary system	77
III. The Bill entails government control	79
IV. The Bill creates a religious endowment	82
V. The Bill provides unsatisfactorily for new schools	85
VI. The Bill violates liberty of conscience in the child	88
VII. The Bill violates liberty of conscience in the rate-payer	92
VIII. The Bill makes capricious use of the Minutes of the Committee of Council	98
IX. The Bill objected to by numerous and influential parties	99
Conclusion	101

APPENDIX:

I. Hulme's Charity	105
II. Common schools of the United States	107

A REVIEW, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

BULKY as it is, the volume before us* is only a fragment in relation to the subject of which it treats. The subject itself is of the highest social interest and importance, it being no less than the entire question of National Education, and of a total revolution in the method of promoting it; but the blue book of 600 pages now vouchsafed to the public does not present to them a discussion of the question as a whole, or even a complete investigation of the local topics more immediately raised. Moreover, we have evidence merely, no conclusion; and partial evidence only, requiring that the thread now abruptly cut should be resumed at some period hereafter, but at present unknown. The book is, in short, as we set out with saying, a fragment, and the public must regard it as nothing more. It is, however, a valuable fragment. Something has been done which will not need to be done again, and a portion of materials, more or less useful, has been contributed to a discussion, the beneficial conduct and termination of which requires no ordinary temper, discernment, and patience.

We begin our further notice of the volume by a brief recital of its history; being thus led to mention some circumstances already widely known, but not so widely as the publication of this parliamentary document will require.

Much honour is due to the men of Manchester; who have rendered that city so eminent, not only for manufacturing skill and commercial enterprise, but for public spirit and energetic action in relation to not a few of the great problems affecting the social and religious welfare of the community. The free-trade agitation had its origin and vital seat in Manchester; and this important question was scarcely settled, when the noble-minded men who had been principally instrumental to its settlement took up the equally—we ought to say, the more important question of popular education. Appreciating, we must confess not at all too highly, the general value of education to the labouring classes, and anxious to promote its advancement at a rate adequate to the wants of a rapidly increasing population, they formed the Lancashire—now the National—Public School Association, having for its object to obtain the sanction of Parliament to a system of common schools supported by local rates. The idea of a school-rate, which had been for a considerable time cherished by individuals as

* Report from the Select Committee on Manchester and Salford Education, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 21st June, 1852.

presenting the only remedy for what they consider to be the failing and exhausted resources of the voluntary system, was received with considerable public favour, and the new Association might have gathered round itself on this ground a very large proportion of the friends of educational progress, had not another, and a leading feature of their bill made it unpalatable to many. It proposed to provide schools for *secular instruction only*, leaving the inculcation of religion to extra-scholastic efforts. Very naturally, considering the religious character hitherto all but universally given to popular education in England, this aspect of the scheme was, not merely unacceptable, but strongly repulsive, to a large class of zealous educationists, by whom subsequently a second association was formed, under the name of the Manchester and Salford School Committee, and having in view—still a rate, but the appropriation of it to none but schools of a religious character.

After various endeavours to indoctrinate the Manchester community with their respective sentiments, and a somewhat zealous canvass for popular favour, both parties prepared for parliamentary war, and the public heard with some excitement of two bills which were about to be introduced into the House of Commons on the subject of popular education, and of the desperate struggle which was thereon to ensue. The Manchester and Salford Committee first took the field, and introduced their bill, we believe, on the first day of the Session on which it was possible to do so. Their tactics were clever, but unfair. As their bill related only to a district—the boroughs of Manchester and Salford, with the townships of Broughton, Pendleton, and Pendlebury—its patrons had it brought in as a private bill; a course by which its discussion would have been much narrowed, while opposition to it would have been made in all cases fearfully expensive, and by many parties impracticable at any cost. Against this trick—for it was nothing better—the friends of Voluntary Education, who, at the last hour, had begun to bestir themselves, and had formed in London a Committee for opposing both the expected bills, promptly and earnestly protested; and they were successful in obtaining the appointment of a Select Committee, to whom the House properly referred, neither the bill of the Manchester and Salford Committee nor the bill of the National Schools Association, (which, although notice was given of it, had not been brought in,) but the general question of the state of education in the district defined.

So far a point was gained, not so much on behalf of any party, as on behalf of justice and free discussion. The appointment of the Committee, however, was not without its difficulties, it was requisite to represent so many parties, and so hard to satisfy those who were in the minority. Of known friends of secular education the proportion on the Committee was so large that the promoters of the local measure stated, through Mr. Brotherton, to whose hands their bill was confided, that they scarcely cared to open their budget before it, while the friends of voluntary education more loudly complained that not a single member of the Committee could be regarded as representative of them. To this latter mischief a partial remedy was applied by placing on the Committee the name of Mr. Peto; and thus constituted, that body commenced its public sittings on the 22nd of April, Mr. Milner Gibson, who moved the appointment of it, being its chairman.

It had been in the first instance arranged that the promoters of the Local Scheme should lead the van, and go fully into their measure, that the promoters of the Secular Scheme should follow them at equal fulness, and that afterwards the Voluntaries and other dissentients should be heard in opposition. This arrangement, however, was not carried out. At the

first public sitting of the Committee it was suggested by Mr. Hadfield, that a possible, and considering the advanced state of the Session, a not improbable effect of it, might be to give all the evidence to be adduced on behalf of the Local and Secular Schemes, while, by the impending dissolution of Parliament, the evidence of the Voluntaries might be thrown over to a period at all events distant, and perhaps never to arrive. So much weight was attached to this suggestion by the Committee, that they agreed to take *en route* two principal witnesses of each party, and afterwards, should time permit, any others whom it might be desirable to hear.* Even this plan, however, was not acted on. It having been intimated by the promoters of the Secular Scheme that their witnesses would not be ready so early, the Voluntaries consented to take their place. So that the matter stands practically thus:—The case of the Locals has been put forward in its strength by the Rev. C. Richson, Mr. Entwisle, and the Dean of Manchester; Mr. Baines and Mr. Adshead have given partial evidence on behalf of the Voluntaries; and the Seculars have not been heard.

Much relating to the Secular Scheme, however, appears in the evidence; but for the most part it appears only incidentally, and as some members of the Committee plainly favourable to that scheme endeavoured to extract from the witnesses they had to examine concessions adverse to their own views—a process under which Mr. Entwisle repeatedly and palpably writhed. Mr. Baines, indeed, was directly questioned on the subject, and gave a very valuable opinion, (1905 to 1911); but as the promoters of this scheme have not yet stated their own case, and as a full investigation of it was repeatedly declined on that ground, we prefer taking no further notice of it here. It will be time enough to do battle with an adversary when we see what ground he has taken, and by what arguments he has fortified it.

Our present business, then, is with the Local scheme exclusively. And we shall most clearly exhibit the large and tangled mass of evidence now before us on this subject, by dividing a review of it into two parts: the first devoted to the grounds of the measure, as stated by Mr. Richson; and the second to the details of the bill in which it is embodied, as explained by Mr. Entwisle.

We have only further to apprise those of our readers who may consult the blue book itself, that they will find in it some serious typographical errors, against the misleading influence of which they will have much need to be on their guard.

* The Committee have not recorded this in their proceedings, but we write from personal knowledge of the fact.

PART I.

THE GROUNDS OF THE LOCAL SCHEME.

CHAPTER I.

THE LOCAL SCHEME PRIMARILY ELEEMOSYNARY.

It appears by the evidence of Mr. Richson (although it was not the first thing he stated), that the object of the local scheme is primarily and strictly eleemosynary. It is avowedly intended to constitute a grand educational charity, securing a gratuitous education to those—the multitudes, as he reckons them—who are unable to pay for it. He opens this aspect of his case in the following terms:—

Recourse to any public fund whatever for promoting education, will depend upon believing that the parents are really unable to pay for their children's education, or are unable to pay it to any large amount; because if they are not unable to pay, (speaking for myself) I should not be disposed to advocate a rate, (353).

And near the close of his examination is the following.

638. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Richson)*. Are the Committee to understand the whole of your system to be laid down upon this principle, that it is necessary to find for the poorer population of Manchester a gratuitous school education?

Ans.—I think so: conditionally that it does not pauperize the people.

The condition attached to this declaration will, no doubt, attract the attention of our readers, and it will require notice from us hereafter; for the present it is enough to have brought out, in Mr. Richson's own unequivocal language, the eleemosynary character of his scheme. He thus reiterates it.

The first consideration with me is whether the people need an effort to be made in this direction at all. If they do not need it, I think we should not proceed any further; therefore, I say in the first place, I would only advocate the giving of assistance out of any public fund, from the conviction that the people needed such public resource to furnish them with education, (358).

The same view is expressly stated by Mr. Entwisle.

769. *Mr. Monsell (to Mr Entwisle)*. Is not the main and principal object of this bill to provide education for the people who are at present so poor as to be unable to pay for admission to the existing schools?

Ans.—Yes.

The scheme is, therefore, undeniably charitable.

This eleemosynary character of the bill is in harmony with the account which Mr. Richson gives of its origin. It appears that, in 1847 and 1848, he put forth a paper, with the intention, if possible, of promoting a rate in aid, under the following title, "Suggestions for promoting an increase of

Free Education for the poor, without prejudice to existing institutions, or the agencies now established for promoting education, and independent of the Voluntary System,"* "The object was," says Mr. Richson, "to obtain a rate to assist those children who are really destitute." This paper, although its plan of dealing *only* with the poor was objected to, was, it seems, "the germ of the present bill," Mr. Entwisle and Mr. John Peel having kindly performed the obstetric operation to a charitable conception, which had otherwise been unhappily "abandoned," (2398).

Now, in order to lay the basis for a scheme of educational charity, it was obviously necessary to make out a case, demonstrating in the first place a great educational deficiency in the school district, and in the second its connexion with poverty as its grand and characteristic cause. Of these in their order.

CHAPTER II.

SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION.

The case substantially—we shall not follow Mr. Richson's method of propounding it, which cannot, for any purpose, be considered as well arranged—consists of two parts; the one relating to school accommodation, the other to school attendance; the former exhibiting the amount of educational means provided, the latter the degree in which they are embraced.

It is in the natural order to speak first of school accommodation.

On this very important part of the subject, the statements of Mr. Richson will produce in the friends of popular education both pleasure and surprise. It appears that there is in Manchester and Salford no want of school accommodation, but that, on the contrary, there is a large excess of it beyond the actual demand. In his twentieth table, Mr. Richson shows that there is in public schools surplus school accommodation, estimated at the large allowance of 8 square feet for each child, for no less than 34,443 children; and he shows afterwards that this surplus school accommodation is so distributed in various localities, and among the several religious denominations with one or another of which they are almost without exception connected, that there is no occasion for any expenditure whatever for the erection of new schools. Such, at least, is his judgment, and (as he assumes) that of the promoters at large of the local scheme. After making allowance for deductions of all kinds from the number stated above, he expresses his general opinion in the following terms:—

It is evident that, in making any new effort to increase school attendance, the accommodation already provided in connexion with religious bodies exceeds in amount all that there is any reason to expect the present population can require, even at the lowest estimate that can be fairly made, (118).

To this we add with pleasure, that Mr. Richson does cordial and ample justice to the voluntary zeal and liberality by which, with comparatively trifling aid from the Committee of Council, this large amount of school

* This paper is in the Appendix, No. 8.

accommodation has been provided. "It appears to me," says he, "that the result of voluntary effort in the erection of school buildings is in the highest degree creditable to the liberality, and to the religious character of the inhabitants of Manchester and Salford," (182); "so that there is no need to introduce into Manchester and Salford any new plan for the erection of school buildings," (207). He adds, that "any attempt to prevent the future exercise of voluntary liberality for the erection of schools would evidently be objectionable, and cast a needless burthen on some public resource," (207). Upon this subject it cannot be necessary for us to go further into detail. It is sufficient to observe that, in relation to the supply of school accommodation, a part of the educational process certainly of primary importance, and generally of a very onerous character, the advocates of the local bill have, by their own confession, no case. Indeed, they do not pretend to have any.

Endeavours were made at a subsequent period of the inquiry, to shew that Mr. Richson's reliance upon the sufficiency of the school accommodation was excessive, but without shaking the confidence of either himself or Mr. Entwisle. One of the members of the Committee was inclined to convert the fact of the surplus school-room into a proof of the failure of educational efforts. This attempt was met in the following manner.

1260. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Entwisle).*—First let me ask you as to the conclusions drawn by the honourable member for Somersetshire, with regard to the extent of school accommodation. Were not a great number of these schools built previously for Sunday schools?

Ans.—I cannot say whether they were previously built for Sunday schools, or not.

1262. If they were built more particularly with reference to Sunday schools, it is not a fair argument, is it, to say that the non-use of them [as day schools] to the full extent of the accommodation afforded, shows, in fact, their failure?

Ans.—No: if the honourable member means this, that the schoolroom has been built capable of containing the whole number of Sunday scholars that could be collected, and those schools are comparatively empty on the week day.

Such is, to a great extent, though not wholly, the origin of the surplus day school accommodation in Manchester.

CHAPTER III.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

We proceed, then, to consider the evidence adduced in respect of school attendance, a part of the subject on which Mr. Richson evidently expected to come forth triumphantly. We shall see. So far as we are concerned, he shall freely tell his own tale; we shall not in all cases, however, employ his own figures. It was one of the infelicities of his position that he had on some points to form estimates, to give approximate numbers, and to make laborious inquiries, while full and authentic statements, as yet unpublished, were in the hands of the government. In the course of the inquiry returns were obtained from the Census office, by

which this portion of Mr. Richson's labours has been superseded ; and we shall be paying him no disrespect, while we shall be rendering greater justice to the matter before us, if in these particulars we pass his figures entirely by, and use at once those supplied by the Registrar General.

According to the official return (Appendix No. 4, Table 11,) there is in the Manchester and Salford contemplated school district, a gross population of 390,566 persons, and of these 130,603 are children under 15 years of age. Of this number 32,113 are under 3 years of age ; so that the number of children between 3 and 15, (which Mr. Richson assumes as "the school age,") is 98,490. The whole number of children under 15 is thus distributed : "in employment," 14,660 ; "scholars," 44,598 ; "undescribed," 71,345. To obtain the number of children "undescribed" between 3 and 15, we deduct from 98,490 (the whole number) first, the whole number "in employment," namely, 14,660 ; and secondly, the number of "scholars" between 3 and 15, or 43,964 ; leaving 40,136 as the number of "undescribed" children between 3 and 15. Let us now deal with these figures as we have them before us, and see how, according to them, education stands in the intended school district.

And first let us observe the ratio of scholars to the population. The population being 390,566, and the scholars 44,598, the children under instruction are 1 in 8.75. Now this is a ratio, if not absolutely satisfactory, at all events not greatly to be complained of. It was estimated by Lord Brougham in 1835, (according to a speech of his in the House of Lords,) that public education would be in a good condition if 1 in 9 were under instruction ; and a Committee of the House of Commons in 1838, reported their opinion to the House, "that it is desirable there should be the means of suitable daily education within the reach of the working classes for not less than about one eighth part of the population," (1580). Here more than one ninth are actually "scholars."

Again, let us observe the ratio of "scholars" to the entire number of children within Mr. Richson's school age. It has been calculated that the state of public education may be deemed satisfactory, if one half of the children within the school age be under instruction at one time. Now here are 98,490 children between 3 and 15 (the school age now assumed), and 43,964 scholars ; a large step at least towards the half, or 49,245. It is highly probable, however, that the number of children under instruction was still larger ; for of children between 3 and 15, 12,721 are returned as "undescribed," and it is surely unfair to conclude that none of these were scholars : this fact, at all events, is not stated, and on the side of omissions, it is pretty certain that the returns must be to some extent erroneous. Some increase, consequently—let it be what the reader pleases—must be made on this score. But further, if to the number actually returned as scholars you add the number "in employment," 14,660, you have much more than half, or 58,264 ; and there is a very great probability—it may be said a certainty—that a large proportion of these would be at school if they were not at work ; that is to say, there is ground for concluding that there would be under instruction much more than half the whole number of children, but for the peculiar facilities which Manchester and its neighbourhood afford for the profitable labour of the young—a cause for the operation of which, upon any system, large allowance must be made.

The case, therefore, is not very frightful, even allowing the school age which Mr. Richson has assumed to be liable to no question. But an

objection may fairly be taken against his arbitrary determination of what he has been pleased to call "the school age." He reckons this period to commence at 3 and to close at 15, and thus includes within it twelve years. It is not easy to see why he has done this. It is certainly on no ground of fact; for some children are known to be sent to school before they are 3, and not a few continue there after they are 15. Nor is it upon any ground of necessity; for he might just as well have taken from 4 to 14, (as indeed he sometimes does) as from 3 to 15, the selection being purely arbitrary. Nor is it upon any ground of practical fitness; for, since the mills at Manchester are open to the employment of children at 13, who are legally recognized at that age as young persons, education among the working classes may be said absolutely to terminate at that age, those who continue "scholars" to a later period being almost invariably of superior station. To this it may be added that very few children go to school between the ages of 3 and 5. The calculations formed on the assumption of Mr. Richson's school age are consequently misleading and unfair.

If we come to consider the period which may fairly be assumed as the school age, we have two limits to assign, one for the commencement, and one for the close. Mr. Baines, being asked at what period he conceives schooling may usefully commence, gives as his opinion that it is not desirable to attempt much in the way of education until five years of age (1521); and to an inquiry as to the period at which children in Manchester leave school, he answers that very many leave from 10 to 11, and comparatively few remain till 12 (1463). We are willing, however, to assume from 5 to 13 as the school age, a period of eight years. To this estimate several members of the committee evidently leant, and the evidence given led to the same conclusion. Assuming one half of the children to be at school at the same time, this allows an average schooling for each child of 4 years, as high an average for the working classes as, in a manufacturing district, can be expected.

Mr. Adshead, indeed, when asked by Lord Blandford (2062), whether "the average number of years during which any child might be expected to attend school would be more than six?" answers, "I should say from 5 to 6." Mr. Baines, however, gave repeatedly and strongly a lower estimate. "I do not hesitate to express my opinion," he said, "that five years of schooling, however desirable, is even more than it is reasonable to expect among the children of the humbler classes in a great manufacturing town, especially when the average is taken from the whole number of the children, without making any deduction for the sick, the crippled, those detained by the sickness of other members of the family, by occasional want of clothes, by the dissipation of parents, or by extreme poverty, or for the children of the vagrant and criminal classes," (1493). See also a similar statement, (1892.)

What Mr. Richson's opinion upon this point is it is not easy to ascertain, his answers are so various and inconsistent. In one case, (63), he affirms that there ought to be "an average attendance of each child of six years," and that "we ought not to be satisfied with anything less" (66). In answer 386 he acknowledges that five years and a half "is rather a sanguine estimate than the reverse." In a subsequent part of his evidence he approaches still nearer to our judgment.

589. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Then considering they become young persons by the Factory Act at 13, would it not be sufficient, supposing your plan were adopted, to give education which should be paid for by rate from 5 to 13?

Ans.—I think it would be very satisfactory. If we could get them all to school between those ages.

In his second examination, however, (2369), he speaks regretfully of “one or two replies given inadvertently” on this subject, and lays down his meaning thus—“I have meant throughout, that, barring impediments arising from physical or intellectual incapacity, we ought not to be satisfied with the period of school attendance until every individual child between the age of 3 and 15 attend school for at least five and a half or six years.” And in the following answer he advances upon this period, and says, “I put six and a half or seven years as the least for an individual child.”

Passing from Mr. Richson, whose view upon this point appears singularly and hopelessly unfixed, to Mr. Entwisle, we get an opinion very nearly in accordance with our own, although somewhat reluctantly given.

1263. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Entwisle).*—As to the length of time in which children can be expected to attend school in the factory districts, what is your opinion upon that head?

Ans.—I should say that it is quite beyond my province to give any opinion.

1264. Will you give the committee your opinion as to whether four years and a half is not, in your judgment, as long a period as it is likely children can be expected to attend school in the factory districts?

Ans.—I think, judging by the opinions of others, that that would be as long a time as the children could be expected to attend school.

1265. From your own observation you think that would be about the time?

Ans.—Yes, I think it very likely: for, as the hon. member knows, early remunerative employment is abundant in those districts.

It cannot be said, therefore, that we are taking a fallacious or unauthorised estimate of the educational period. Now, Table 11 from the Census office enables us to state the number both of children and scholars between 5 and 13. Of children there are 65,109; and of scholars, 36,478, or considerably more than half. Such a result is, we think, gratifying; and the more so as it evidently supplies materials for the more extended period of education which must be taken to prevail among children of the higher classes.*

Having thus taken, as was proper in the first instance, the figures of the Registrar General as he has given them, we have now to observe that these do not fully represent the amount of education enjoyed by the good people of Manchester and Salford,

A considerable proportion of the children of the higher classes are sent to schools out of the district. This, in reply to Mr. Gladstone (39), was acknowledged by Mr. Richson himself, who admitted the number to be “very large,” although difficult to be precisely estimated. The only clue we get to his opinion on this point is, that the number sent to school out of Manchester would probably be less than that sent to superior schools (schools where the payment is quarterly) in it. The children of this latter class he states at 5,227: we may with his consent, therefore, state the former at 4,000. Now of these the Registrar General could render no account, as not on the day of the Census resident in Manchester; they

* The reader may see the same problem worked out by Mr. W. Miles, with slightly different figures, but with substantially similar result, in the Evidence from 1526 to 1530. Mr. Ashead also performs a similar process, but confines his calculations to the borough of Manchester, (2450).

must therefore be added to his return of 44,598 scholars, making a total of 48,598. We are aware that these must be added also to the number of children within the school age, and that a certain proportion of them may be beyond 15; but after all deductions, there will be a considerable gain on the side of education.

To this it may fairly be added, that, among the higher classes also, a considerable number of young persons continue under instruction beyond the age of 15. These cannot be brought into the numerical computation, but they ought not to be excluded from an estimate of the general educational condition of the district.

It is stated by Mr. Richson (2308) that there are 1,198 children attending day-schools "not included in the Census tables." Mr. Horace Mann, of the Census Office, being examined by the Committee on this subject, he admitted the fact to be as stated by Mr. Richson, and added with great naïveté, that these returns "were found to be in the office subsequently to making up the tables," (2309); a statement which supplies a hint of some importance as to the degree of faith to be put even in official documents. It does not appear, however, that this omission affects the return of "scholars," but only that of day-school attendance, which it raises from 33,663 to 34,861.

CHAPTER IV.

EXPLANATIONS.

We must now trouble our readers with a few words of explanation, referring to certain statements to be met with in the papers before us, which differ more or less materially from those we have given above, but which we have not noticed in the first instance, because we wished to give the preceding view unembarrassed.

The first statement to which we draw attention is to be found in the Census Office return (Appendix No. 4, Table 17,) exhibiting the "Day-scholars in various large towns." The Day-scholars in the Manchester and Salford Education District are here stated at 33,663. The difference between this number and 44,598, which we have already given from another table (No. 11) as the number of "scholars" is striking, and may for the moment appear inexplicable; a Note appended to Table 11 by the Registrar General, however, supplies the clue to it. The head of each family, it appears, "was directed to insert in the column for 'Rank, Profession, or Occupation,' the word 'scholar' opposite the name of every child daily attending school, or *receiving instruction under a master or governess at home*. For various reasons, therefore," the Registrar General very properly adds, "this statement will not agree with the number of scholars derived from the returns made by masters and mistresses of schools."

This discrepancy was observed by the Committee, who examined Mr. Horace Mann, of the Census Office, in relation to it, and received from him a similar explanation to that supplied by the Note of the Registrar General, (2287). The following question was then put to him.

2288. *Chairman (to Mr. Mann).*—Have you any reason to doubt in your office that the first return is accurately made out by the heads of families?

Ans.—I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of both returns.

It is clear, therefore, that the returns made of day-school attendance do not represent the educational condition of the community in the school district, by about one fourth of the number of children under instruction.

A second statement to which it is necessary to call the reader's attention, is one made by Mr. Richson respecting the proportion of children who may be expected, in such a district, to attend school at the same period. We have already referred to the usually accepted estimate, that a simultaneous school attendance of one half the children within the school age exhibits a satisfactory educational condition among the operative classes. Mr. Richson, however, takes different ground. Laying it down (44) that, in the school district, the children between 3 and 15 of a class of life to attend common elementary schools amount to 84,566, and finding that the total number of that class attending school is 27,346, he proceeds to announce two startling facts; the first is, that there are 57,220 children not attending school, and the second, that in addition to the 27,346 already attending school, one-half of this 57,220, or 28,610, in all 55,956—ought to be so.

We object here, *in limine*, to the statement that there are 57,220 children "not attending school." Although literally true, it (as is justly observed by Mr. Baines, 1490) "creates a false impression," which it is difficult for subsequent explanations to remove. Nearly 15,000 of these are, as returned by the Registrar General, "in employment;" and they are, consequently, quite out of question as to being at school or not at school. The number is thus reduced at once to about 42,000; but this is too high, the total children between 3 and 15 returned to the Census Office as "undescribed" amounting to only 40,000. The false impression created by this statement is manifest in the following question by a member of the Committee.

70. *Chairman (to Mr. Richson).*—Then the 57,000 that you speak of are precisely the persons for whom assistance should be given, if it is to be given to anybody, by providing education at the public expense?

In justice, Mr. Richson's answer to this question ought to have been, "No: not the 57,000, but only such proportion of them as it may be presumed ought to be at school." He suffered this obvious misconception, however, to remain uncorrected.

In the next place, we object still more strongly to the assertion that the half of this 57,220, or 28,610, ought to be at school. On this mode of representing the case Mr. Baines justly remarks as follows.

Now this is a mere oversight, arising from his having inverted the order of an arithmetical process; but it is singular that Mr. Richson did not discover so great an error, as it is in glaring contradiction to another explicit statement given very soon afterwards. In answer 60 he says, 'At present it appears there are about 29,077 children, including the workhouse in Swinton, that are receiving daily education, . . . and we think we should raise the number to 42,670; and that would be about one half the total number between 3 and 15, the total number being 84,566. The number which we hope they will amount to by these means is 42,670; and we think probably that is as many as could be expected in a manufacturing district to be got to school under very favourable circumstances.' . . . Now if the utmost number of children that could be expected to be at this class of schools in Manchester is 42,670, and there are actually 29,077 found there, it is surely only the difference between these two numbers, or 13,593, who can be considered to be wanting education.

Yet, Mr. Richson had stated conspicuously in his third conclusion, 'that about 57,000 are not attending day-schools, while of this number at least nearly half, or 28,500, ought to be at some school,' (1488).

The result of this erroneous process, is about to double the real educational deficiency which he himself wishes to prove and to provide for, (1490).

Mr. Baines's apology for Mr. Richson's statement as "an arithmetical error," palpable as this error was to the Committee, was far from being acceptable to the rev. gentleman himself. In his second examination he strongly reiterates, and attempts to vindicate it (2338 and 2397), so that it is incumbent upon us to pay to it some further attention.

It has been usual among educationists to take a general view of the causes adapted to facilitate or impede school attendance in a given locality, and to calculate the average attendance which, under the circumstances, may reasonably be expected. Mr. Richson, however, resists the adoption of this process. These are his words :—

2341.—*Marquis of Blandford (to Mr. Richson).*—What proportion of those not at school ought to be at school ?

Ans.—I think we are not to set out by saying that here are 100,000 children, and 50,000 ought to be at school. There is a certain number of children not at school out of the total number ; the question is, what proportion is kept from school for justifiable reasons. I say that, as applied to Manchester, we cannot find, in regard to one half, any reasonable cause why they should be kept away from school.

2343. You admit that only a certain proportion ought to be at school ?

Ans.—No ; I do not admit any fixed proportion. I admit absence where it has justifiable reason.

2344. Taking the whole number 100,000, are there not certain causes operating that might necessarily keep away a certain portion of those children from school ?

Ans.—The proportion I could not attempt to define, nor do I think any body else can.

2345. Then I do not see upon what solid basis your calculations are founded ?

Ans.—I show the Committee that there is no reasonable excuse for even half the children being kept away that are not attending at school.

We do not think that it contributed to raise Mr. Richson in the estimate of the Committee, that he was thus resolutely determined to reject the judgment of men who had gone over the same ground before him, and with not merely equal, but certainly with better opportunities of making an approximation to the truth ; or that they felt he was likely to arrive at it by the small modicum of evidence he was able to adduce as the foundation of his opinion. We must, however, as it seems, examine this evidence, and see how far it may bear him out.

I consider it a very fair test on the subject we have in view, says he, to take the case of 17,426 families selected from twenty-six different parts of the two boroughs. In these families the total number of children between 3 and 14 [he considers this the same as between 3 and 15] were 36,527. . . . The number at school (by Table 29) is 14,197, leaving 22,330 either at home or at work ; of which number, if my estimate is correct, there is no reasonable cause why 11,165 children should not be at school. Turning again to the Table, we find 5,153 children at work, 1801 kept at home from sickness or sundry causes, and 2,670 as being too young. The total is 9,624 children, who may be assumed to be kept from school on account of reasons sufficiently important to justify their absence ; but then there remain out of

the 22,330 children just mentioned, 12,706 children kept at home from the indifference of parents to the subject of education, or from their inability or unwillingness to pay the school fees. Now as impediments to school attendance of this character are removable, and ought to be removed, I say there is no reasonable cause for these 12,706 children being absent from school, (2338).

This is cleverly put, and the coincidence in the numbers is certainly felicitous. We submit, however, 1. That this reasoning assumes the absolute correctness and adequacy of Table 29, an honour to which it is by no means entitled. 2. That the 2,670 children kept from school as "too young," cannot be allowed to be kept at home for a sufficient reason, since they were 3 years old and upwards, and thus, for all purposes of calculation, within the school age. This number ought consequently to be added to the 12,706 who, according to Mr. Richson, ought to have been at school; and the sum would be 15,377—much nearer three-fourths than one half of the 22,330 who were not at school. 3. That Mr. Richson cannot be permitted to employ Table 29 for the purpose of calculating an *average* for the entire school district. He hates averages, and asserts repeatedly and vehemently that he will have nothing to do but with the known case of the individual; and we are entitled to keep him to his word. 4. That, if the average were taken, according to this Table, of the possible school attendance in the whole population, we should have an utterly incredible result. Thus out of 36,527 children we should have at school the following numbers:—

Present attendance	14,197
Absent from alleged poverty	12,067
Absent from indifference of parents	639
Absent from being too young	2,670

Or a total of 29,573 children out of 36,127, or very nearly six-sevenths of the whole number! This is educational philanthropy become dizzy.

We suspect, however, that this recourse to Table 29 is an after-thought, and that Mr. Richson in the first instance had no intention of availing himself of so dangerous a refuge. We are led to this conclusion by the repeated instances in which he himself adopts the principle, that one half of the whole number of children are as many as can be expected at school at a time. Giving an account of the object he aimed at, he says,—“We think we ought to endeavour to raise this number [of scholars] to 42,670, which would be about one half the total number between 3 and 15; the total number being 84,566. The number then which we wish to bring into school by these means is 42,670, and we think probably that is as many as could be expected, in a manufacturing district, to be induced to attend school under very favourable circumstances.” He affirms the same principle, when, in answer to Mr. W. Miles (128) he says of this number and proportion, “That, I expect, is the total number we could get to school under the most favourable circumstances.” In answer to Mr. Peto, he says,—“We think we ought to have one half at least of those between 3 and 15 at school,” (62); and afterwards, “We have only assumed the maximum school attendance to be one half of the children requiring to go to school between the ages of 3 and 15,” (590).

Mr. Richson, indeed, makes a determined attempt to escape from this conclusion, and to evade (we cannot use a milder term) the force of his own language. In his answer 2338 he wishes it to be understood that he named 42,000, or the half of 84,000, only as the measure of the

success he might hope for, if so much, within 3 or 4 years. We do not think, however, that his language can be restricted to this meaning. The number of children that could be got to school "*under the most favourable circumstances*," is surely the whole number that can reasonably be expected there. Besides, in the words we have quoted from his answer 960, he speaks of this proportion as being "as many as could be expected in a manufacturing district under very favourable circumstances," again generalizing the conception.

Still more unsatisfactory is Mr. Richson's attempt to get rid of his answer to Mr. Bright, who had asked him the following question :—

129. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—The number you calculate upon to attend school is 42,670 ?

Ans. Yes.

130. You conceive that if that number attended school, the population of Manchester and Salford would be as well educated as it was possible for them to be ?

Ans. I think we should have great reason to be thankful if we got that number.

Mr. Richson deals with this reply in the following manner :—

In answer to 9130, where, as I understood, I was asked to affirm that 'if that number attended school, the population of Manchester and Salford would be as well educated as it was possible for them to be,' no one, I think, can mistake that I declined any such inference, limiting my reply to these words, 'I think we shall have reason to be very thankful if we get such a number,' (2338).

Mr. Bright evidently noticed the equivocal character of this language, and added the following question :—

"*Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—You would not consider it necessary to come for an act of Parliament to increase the number ?

Ans.—I hope not. I should be very sorry to see any compulsory system of education adopted.

Now we ask Mr. Richson what is the meaning of this ? Was this too an intended evasion ? Or does it not, beyond the power of evasion, imply—what, for some reason quite unintelligible to us, he was so reluctant expressly to state—that the numerical proportion was satisfactory, and that if another act of parliament should be desired, it would not be to increase the number, but only to coerce attendance ? It gives us more pain than we can express to make these remarks. From the first moment we saw him, we gave Mr. Richson credit for as much frankness as benevolence ; and these indications of a want of candour can neither afford pleasure to good men, or render service to a good cause.

We must, however, give Mr. Richson the benefit of a certain confusion of mind, under which he was evidently labouring from the first in relation to this point. How very far he was from clearly apprehending the facts of the case, may appear by the following instances.

After stating that "there cannot be less than 57,220 children between 3 and 15, of a class of life to attend common elementary schools, who are not attending them," he is thus examined—

249. *Lord J. Russell (to Mr. Richson).* How many does that make not attending those schools ?

Ans. The whole of these are not attending.

Why, surely those cannot be reckoned as “not attending” in the sense of this inquiry and of Lord John Russell’s question—that is, voluntarily not attending—who, being either in employment or hindered by justifiable causes, could not be expected to attend. The proper answer to this question would have been, that the number of children after whom his Lordship inquired would be stated afterwards.

Here is another example of the same fallacy.

175. *Mr. Brotherton (to Mr. Richson).* Can you show the number of children who do not avail themselves of the accommodation which is afforded in the day schools?

Ans. The number would be the difference between those attending and the total number of age and class in life to attend the schools.

Clearly not. The number wanted is the difference between those who are at school and those who may be reasonably expected to be there. Children at work, cripples, idiots, the sick, and many others, can never be classed with those “who do not avail themselves” of school accommodation.

In one instance the rev. gentleman goes a great deal farther than even this. In page 9 he presents a table, (Table 6) “the result of which,” he says, “is, that the total number of children in a class of life to avail themselves of common elementary schools is 84,566, for whom we ought to provide the means of education.” What, for all the 84,566? Including the 27,000 who are at school already, the 15,000 who are at work, and the thousands physically unable into the bargain? But lately he was content with setting down the number at 55,000; now they have sprung up to 84,000! Not Falstaff’s men in buckram multiplied so fast. At a subsequent period, when Mr. Richson was developing his plan for raising the number of school attendants to 42,670, Mr. Bright noticed this statement in the following manner.

457. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—It appears to me that the statements you have made to-day differ somewhat considerably from the table you put in on a former day. You state in p. 9 of the first day’s evidence, that the result of this table is, “that the number of children in a class of life to avail themselves of the common elementary schools we consider to be, between the ages of 3 and 15, 84,566, for whom we ought to provide the means of education.” . . . But you propose now to do so upon a very much lower estimate than that. I presume that you consider, or your Committee believe, that the proper course would be to make a provision for this larger number, according to your original statement?

Ans.—There is no discrepancy that I can see between my two statements. In making an educational provision for 84,000,* I stated distinctly that I never contemplated having 84,000* at school at once.

Mr. Bright is certainly not wanting in quickness of apprehension; but even he was bewildered by this Manchester mystery, that a scheme for getting 42,000 children to school was making provision for the education of 84,000.

To us, however, the most curious case of all is that in which two different numbers are blended in the same answer. Having put in his calculation that the number of children “for whom we ought to provide the means of education” was 84,500, his examination thus proceeded.

* Erroneously printed 87,000.

43. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Richson).*—In your judgment, is it at all likely that children in Manchester, in such a condition of life, would require to go to school for 11 years?

Ans.—Certainly not.

44. If such be the fact, assuming that something like half that period would be as long a time as people in that condition of life in Manchester would send their children to school for, does not that reduce your calculation at least by one-half?

Ans.—I think so: and I have taken that calculation eventually, that somewhere about half that number ought to be in school.

Here the meaning is clear enough; “half that number” is half 84,566. Yet at the end of the very same answer, he tells us that the number not attending school is 57,220, and adds,—“I assume that one-half *that number* is about the number that may be expected to go to school”! Certainly the clear head is of some use in affairs, as well as the good heart.

CHAPTER V.

EVENING SCHOOLS.

An important branch of the educational process in Manchester is formed by the Evening schools. Mr. Richson’s treatment of these in his first examination is very brief and cavalier. He just mentions in table 9, that the “attendance at evening schools connected with the various religious bodies in Manchester and Salford” amounts to 3,733; and, in answer to a question from Mr. W. Miles (46), he makes the following statement.

The summary of our returns is this: there are 2,168* males, and 1,565 females, and the ages of a few are as low as 8 and 9; the majority are from 15 to 18 and upwards.

In fact, however, he takes no account of these, or any of them, in his educational estimate of the district. On this Mr. Baines makes the following observations.

With regard to evening schools and classes, Mr. Richson gives only the evening school attendance in connexion with the several religious denominations, the number being 3,733. This return is doubly restricted, first, by giving only the “actual attendance,” which is always considerably below the number really belonging to those schools, and secondly, by confining his return to the “religious denominations.” He thus excludes the evening classes of the Mechanics’ Institution, where there are about 500 pupils; of the Miles Platting Mechanics’ Institution, where there are 154 pupils; of the Ancoats Lyceum, where there are 20 pupils; of the Chorlton and Medlock Mechanics’ and Temperance Institution, where there are 75 pupils, and probably of other public institutions, besides all the private evening schools, which I am assured are numerous, though small. In 1834-5 these private evening schools were 109 in number, and included 1,723 scholars; and the report of the statistical society said of this class of schools, that, “though not numerous, they are generally more effective than other schools, as none attend them who do not wish to learn, and who are not of an age to appreciate the advantages that are thus afforded them. Some of these scholars are adults, and the great majority are from 14 to 18 years of age. These schools are principally kept by masters of day schools, and the terms for instruction are often higher than

* Erroneously printed 22,168.

in the day schools." I do not think that Mr. Richson should have added the evening scholars to the day scholars ; but I think he should have given the numbers of evening scholars at private schools and at public institutions, as well as the full number of those in connexion with religious denominations ; and also it would be well if he had pointed out the real value of these evening schools, as supplementary both to the day schools and the Sunday schools, especially in a place where children go to labour so early. If, as seems not improbable from the above figures, there should be 6,000 or 7,000 children and young persons receiving instruction in evening schools, it would make an important feature in the school statistics of Manchester, (1485).

Mr. Adshead also laid considerable stress on the evening schools ; but Mr. Richson was inexorable. The following is the part of his second examination which relates to them.

2310. *Chairman (to Mr Richson).* Will you give your reason for the omission of the evening scholars at private schools ?

Ans.—With the exception of the evening classes of the Manchester Mechanics' Institution, I believe the return in Table 19 gives within, perhaps, 200 or 300, the total number of evening scholars belonging to the public schools in Manchester ; and if Mr. Baines had given 4,500 as the total number of young persons receiving instruction in evening schools, including all the institutions he has mentioned, I think he would have been nearer the correct number, than assuming 6,000 or 7,000 ; but his statements here are very vague. But be this as it may, my reason for not entering very minutely into the question of evening schools is this : I do not attach sufficient importance to the present unsystematized mode of conducting those schools ; nor, however useful they may be in some cases in supplying the educational defects of young persons, do I regard them as such adequate substitutes for the early and regular training of the day school, as to attach any great importance to them generally, as educational institutions. The time may come, when they may more effectually conduce to adult education ; and if I should ever see them brought into connexion with, or made preparatory to, schools of design and schools of practical science, I should entertain a much higher opinion of their utility than I do at present. Entertaining these views, Mr. Baines will scarcely be surprised that I did not in my former evidence, and that I do not intend now, to enter more into detail in respect to these schools.

2311. But still in those evening schools it is a voluntary attendance, and a voluntary payment, is it not ?

Ans.—Yes.

2312. Consequently, with regard to those who wish to improve themselves in education, do you not think that they may be looked upon as useful adjuncts in the education of the operative classes ?

Ans.—I admit their utility to a limited extent ; but I know they are badly conducted frequently, although in some cases, no doubt, they may be pretty well conducted. I know in some instances they are little better than reading schools, and are taught by teachers of Sunday schools not very much in the habit of teaching those branches of education with which we wish to see the working classes more familiarized ; but I complain of their being unsystematized. They are not such schools as I think important, in their present form, in an educational inquiry.

2313. There are some children between the ages of 13 [3] and 15, who attend those evening schools, are there not ?

Ans.—Yes, I believe so. There are some in connexion with the Mechanics' Institution in Manchester ; but that institution is very well known to have changed its character very much indeed ; and instead of being an institution for the working classes, as such, it is very well known that there are very few working people, "very few fustian jackets," ever seen in the theatre of that institution.

2314. Whether your calculation as to the evening schools is right, or Mr. Baines's, as far as those between the ages of 13 [3] and 15 go, they should be

included in the calculation which you have put in of the instruction given between 3 and 15, should they not ?

Ans.—I think not. I do not admit that the evening schools should be substituted for the day schools in any form.

2315. As the operative classes are engaged in the day-time, would it not be of great importance that good evening schools should be established ?

Ans.—If good evening schools were established for the adult population, as I have said before, and in connexion with a higher class of study for the adult population, or for young persons after they had benefited by the day schools, I should be delighted to see them in that position ; but I do not think their present form is such as to entitle us to estimate them very highly in an educational inquiry like this.

2320. In your estimate you have taken, have you not, what you consider the whole of the population between 3 and 15, and you have shown the number of scholars there are in the different denominational schools and others ; of course you have included those who are under good education, indifferent education, and bad education ; and, if so, what reason had you to leave out those scholars that attend evening schools between the ages of 13 [3] and 15 ?

Ans.—Because, first of all, I had not a return of the precise number of those children who attend evening schools only.

2321. If you had had such a return they should have been included, should they not ?

Ans.—I am not prepared to say that I should have included them ; because it appears to me that if, in the present inquiry, evening schools are to be taken into the account for children between 13 and 15, they must also be taken into account in respect to children of all such ages as now attend them ; but if this be allowed, I must adopt a much lower estimate of school attendance than I have yet done.

When we read these questions and answers, we were struck, and for the moment confused, by the reference made in them to those who attend evening schools “between the ages of 13 and 15.” Unable to discover how the “ages of 13 and 15” could have come into this question, we set it down at last that this was a typographical error, the ages really mentioned being 3 and 15. The fact that Mr. Richson’s answer (2321) is founded upon the ages 13 and 15 being scarcely consistent with this view, however, we turned to some notes of the examination taken at the time, and we found that the answer which Mr. Richson really gave was as follows :—

I am not prepared to say that I should have included them, unless I had thought more of that subject. I was concerned more with the day schools than with any others in this inquiry.

Had Mr. Richson sanctioned the publication of this language, we should have respectfully suggested to him, that he was concerned, not with any class of schools in particular, but with the subject of education in Manchester generally ; and that his statement that he had not thought sufficiently about the evening schools to ask for returns of them, or even to know whether, if these returns had laid upon his desk, he would have included them in his Tables, amounted to a confession of extreme inconsideration and culpable neglect : as it is, we have only to congratulate him on his having found an opportunity of deleting it. It is not often, we presume, that a typographical error in the question serves so felicitously for the basis of an answer which was never delivered. The fabrication was effected, no doubt, in the correction of the proof.

Evening schools find no favour with Mr. Richson. He will not only not allow them to be substituted for day schools, he will not allow them to be added to the day schools. The hour is so vital an element in his

educational philosophy, that if there were in Manchester 50,000 children between 3 and 15 attending evening schools ever so assiduously and profitably, we should hear nothing of them from him.

It would seem, however, that no addition to the number of "scholars" can be made on this ground to the larger return from the Census office (Appendix No. 4, Table 11), as Mr. Mann intimates (2287) that this "will include also children attending evening schools."

CHAPTER VI.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

As an important auxiliary to popular education, the Sunday School system was, as a matter of course, noticed by all parties.

Manchester, said Mr. Baines, has been celebrated for its Sunday schools since the year 1785, the year after they were originated by Robert Raikes, at Gloucester; and its Sunday schools are not only extraordinary for their number of scholars, but for the excellence of their teaching (of which I speak from some personal observation), and for the great respectability of their superintendants and teachers, (1486).

This topic was most prominently brought forward by Mr. Adshead, who commenced his evidence with a full statistical display, (1973, *et seq.*) Mr. Richson and Mr. Baines differed as to the number of children in the Manchester and Salford Sunday Schools, Mr. Baines reckoning them at 68,603, and Mr. Richson at 51,452 *; but we do not think it necessary to go into this question. The number in either case is very large. We turn rather to the testimony borne to the educational value of the system.

1989. *Mr. Brotherton (to Mr Adshead).*—Are you of opinion that the education given at the Sunday schools to the working classes is sufficient for the general population of Manchester?

Ans.—With the education that they receive at the evening schools, I think they may obtain a good amount of education.

1993. *Mr. W. Miles.*—The Committee are not to understand that you think the Sunday school instruction which is given is sufficient for the population of Manchester, but as an adjunct to the other?

Ans.—Yes; as an adjunct, and an important adjunct.

1994. You would not yourself consider it sufficient instruction for the population?

Ans.—I think it is sufficient instruction for the operative classes, with the opportunities that they might have of improving themselves in writing or arithmetic on week day evenings, [and other schools which are open to them.]†

1995. But the evening schools, as I understand them, are not so much attended by children, as by operatives employed in the mills?

Ans.—I should say so.

1996. Then, setting that aside, do you think that, for children between the ages of 5 and 13, the Sunday school instruction would be sufficient, without any other elementary schools?

Ans.—I should say it would not be sufficient.

This part of Mr. Adshead's evidence did not pass unnoticed in Mr. Richson's second examination.

* Mr. Adshead confines his estimate to Manchester only.

† These words were added in the proof.

2323. I must emphatically dissent, said the rev. gentleman, from Mr. Adshead's notion, (1994) that Sunday school instruction 'is sufficient for the operative classes, with the opportunities that they might have of improving themselves in writing or arithmetic on week day evenings.' Indeed, so far am I from sympathising with such a view of the relation between the operative classes and the Sunday school, that, beneficial as Sunday schools have evidently been, particularly in the manufacturing districts, and necessary, and even important, as their present sustentation must be allowed to be, I should be exceedingly sorry to see any general system of education receive the sanction of the legislature which rendered indispensable the continuance of Sunday schools on their present system. I could most earnestly wish the Sunday to be beneficially employed by all classes of the community, and especially I could wish to see on every Sunday the old rule carried out, of 'fathers, mothers, masters, and dames bringing their children, servants, and apprentices,' to be instructed by the minister of the church or congregation, and prepared, perhaps, for an hour or two previously, in different classes, by educated pious people; but, as I am most unwilling to recognize any system as satisfactory, which necessarily separates children from their parents during five or seven hours on the only day in every week which affords an opportunity for developing that sympathy and affection which ought to subsist between children and their parents, I cannot attach to Sunday schools all that importance, as educational agencies, which Mr. Adshead appears to do.

Our two witnesses are thus at variance, and nothing is left to us but to judge between them. Fortunately, as is not seldom the case, the divergent parties have taken the extreme points of the ground, and have left a palpable *via media*, which is, in our judgment, much to be preferred to either extreme.

We certainly (and we must say it frankly) cannot concur with Mr. Adshead, who, from the confused and tangled character of his answers, evidently spoke without a clear conception of what he intended to say. Quite as little, however, can we concur with Mr. Richson. On the one hand, he does undeniable injustice to Mr. Adshead by taking his answer 1994, and not giving him the benefit of the subsequent answer (1996), by which it is largely qualified; and on the other hand, his main objection to the Sunday school is drawn from an antiquated ecclesiasticism with which the age has no sympathy. As to children enjoying the company of their parents on Sundays, Mr. Richson knows very well, and in his answer (2333) to the Marquis of Blandford, expressly admitted, that "in the present state of things, if children did not attend Sunday schools, instead of being in the company of parents, they would be idling their time away;" to which it may be added, that there are a countless number of parents whose "company" on the Sunday would be found very little adapted to benefit their children. We hold the Sunday school to be an invaluable institution; and although, like Mr. Richson, we should not wish to see it enforced by law, we hope to see its growing development as an effort of christian zeal and love. We do not think its moral benefits are at all too strongly described in the following passage of Mr. Adshead's evidence:—

1978. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—What is your opinion as to the moral influence of Sunday schools upon the community?

Ans.—I am of opinion that Sunday schools have had in this country, for the last thirty years, a vast moral influence, in producing that quiet and good order which so extensively prevail among our operative classes, and has been promotive of that principle of conservatism, which, in times of public agitation and excitement, has mainly tended to save the country from such outbreaks as have convulsed other countries. And notwithstanding that, in Manchester and its neighbourhood, there are all the elements of combustion, it may be decidedly

affirmed, that the moral influence to which reference has been made has greatly proved our security and safeguard....I consider that it is impossible to estimate too highly the powerful religious influence diffused among the community by these institutions. There are thousands now in association with those institutions who have received in them the first rudiments of their education ; in them their moral and religious characters have been moulded and formed, and they are now teachers, conductors, or superintendants, thus exercising a beneficial influence upon a succeeding generation. The Sunday school is peculiarly an institution which brings together the middle and the lower classes, and forms that bond of union between these two important sections of the community, which no other existing combination affords.

The religious and social value of the Sunday school system, however, stands distinctly apart from its educational or scholastic value. No improvement in it has, in our opinion, been greater than the gradual extrusion from it of all that can properly be called school learning, and the consecration of sabbath hours to uses exclusively sacred. Instead of saying that the Sunday school is "not sufficient" for the education of the children of the operative classes, without the day school, we should say rather that, in respect of education, the Sunday school ought not to be taken into account at all. Let everything be done in the day school as though no Sunday schools were in existence. Give there the best and completest education you can ; and if anything can be added to it on the Sunday, let it be religious information and culture, of which there never can be too much.

We must enter our caveat, however, against the use which some of the secular educationists in the Committee attempted to make of the religious character of Sunday school instruction, when they would have made it a plea for the exclusion of religion from the day school. Thus the Chairman, Mr. Milner Gibson (who, to say the truth, was always on the watch for opportunities of this kind,) plied Mr. Adshead with interrogatories after this manner.

2008. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—It may be said, may it not, that it is the religious zeal of the community that keeps the Sunday school system upon its present footing ?

Ans.—Yes.

2009. Supposing, for instance, that the day school system were to be secular, would the religious zeal which now keeps those Sunday schools upon their present footing become depressed ?

Ans.—I do not think it would.

2010. You think that religious zeal would still keep a continual fountain of religious instruction flowing through the community, through the medium of the Sunday schools, even if the day schools were secular ?

Ans.—Yes.

Observing the artful bearing of these questions, a member of the Committee who generally had both his eyes open, came to the rescue.

2017. *Mr. W. Miles.*—May I ask you whether you think, if secular instruction only were given on week days, the religious and moral instruction given on Sunday would be sufficient to lay the foundation of a good moral and religious education ?

Ans.—You cannot ensure that every child that goes to a day school will go to a Sunday school.

2019. If you could be sure that a boy would go to both, it would satisfy you that the instruction in the day school should be secular, and in the Sunday school religious ?

Ans.—But many might not go to the Sunday school at all.

We recollect very well how Mr. Gibson and Mr. Miles smiled at one another, on seeing Mr. Adshead thus run into a corner; but we beg here to give for him the answer which it did not occur to him at the moment to give for himself—namely, that, if a child did go to both the Sunday and the day school, the religious instruction given at the one could form no justification for its omission at the other. Religion is, in our judgment, far too important an element in education to be abandoned to the Sunday school.

It appeared that some members of the Committee could scarcely believe that the vast body of Sunday school teachers were decently adapted for their office.

1659. *Mr. K. Seymer (to Mr. Baines).*—What qualifications for teaching have those voluntary instructors in those Sunday schools?

Ans.—They are for the most part religious persons of intelligence, selected by the superintendants of those schools. In some cases their qualifications are high, and in others they are not high; they comprise persons in all classes, persons of the highest, of the middle, and of the lower classes. A considerable number of the lower classes, who themselves have passed through the Sunday schools, have become members and communicants of the churches, and are teachers now, and of them it may be said that their educational and literary qualifications are not high; but perhaps their moral and religious qualifications may be as high as those of any of the other classes.

1662. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Baines).*—It appeared in a petition that I presented not long ago to the House, signed by several Sunday school teachers, consisting of only four sentences, not one sentence of which was grammatically constructed, and not one sentence of which had not one or two words incorrectly spelt: would you think that such teachers were proper persons to be entrusted with the work of education, even if it were confined to religious instruction?

Ans.—I have no hesitation at all in saying, that I am quite convinced that many such persons might be as well qualified as the best scholars in the land to give moral and religious instruction. That is all that is attempted in Sunday schools. There may be the most deeply pious and earnest persons in the world amongst those of the lower classes who are led to become teachers, but who do not possess any high literary qualifications.

The friends of Sunday schools will thank Mr. Baines for this answer.

CHAPTER VII.

PROVING TOO MUCH.

Our readers are now in a condition to judge of an assertion, which has been so often and so loudly made that its truth has almost come to be admitted without examination; namely, that at Manchester and Salford children are to a deplorable degree uneducated. Even in the minds of many members of the Committee this seemed to have the place of a foregone conclusion, and to operate with a force which nothing could resist. The evidence was more than once interrupted by questions which assumed the evil, and almost rudely demanded the admission of it.

1456. *Mr. Brotherton (to Mr. Baines).*—How do you mean to apply these facts in relation to education? Is it to prove that the population of Manchester is as well or better educated than the population of other counties, or is it to show that there can be no increased education in these towns?

Ans.—Neither the one nor the other, strictly. Certainly not the former, and I had not intended it for the latter; but to show that the industrial circumstances of these respective counties and towns account, in a great measure, for the small proportion of day scholars in Manchester and in Lancashire.

1457.—Have you had any means of ascertaining whether there is any necessity for increased means of education in Manchester?

Ans.—That is a part of the subject to which I shall come afterwards.

In the same spirit another member of the Committee put the following question.

1559. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Baines).*—After all the deductions that you have made, does not the impression still remain, that there is in Manchester and Salford a very large number of children unprovided with the means of education?

Ans.—I fully believe that there is not. If there is a number, I believe that that number does not bear any large proportion to the population.

We honour Mr. Baines for the courage displayed in this answer, and official philanthropists who looked amazed at it may do well afresh to examine the grounds on which it was given.

We may be asked, however, whether we have not proved too much, and whether we really think that there are as many children at school in Manchester and Salford as there ought to be. Far from it. The striking of a satisfactory average is sure to leave room for many unsatisfactory cases. If one half the children between 5 and 13 were always at school, however this might authorize the inference, that, generally speaking, the children were under instruction during four years; this inference would not be universally applicable to individual cases, some being at school much more than four years, some much less, and some not at all. Among so many thousand children, therefore, there is doubtless a proportion, although not precisely determinable, who ought to be at school and are not. This is the proper field for the exercise of educational philanthropy, and we readily admit it to be an interesting and extensive one. On this subject, however, we have to make two remarks.

A class of children who ought to be at school and are not will be found to exist under every conceivable system, short of universal and absolute compulsion. Even admitting that much may be done to diminish the present magnitude of this class, by improving the quality of education, by multiplying its facilities, and by augmenting the desire for it, no one can, under any circumstances, anticipate its entire extinction otherwise than by compulsion. Its existence is an evil which, consequently, must be put up with, even by philanthropists who, like Mr. Richson, eschew compulsion, with such tranquillity as they may be able to maintain.

Further, the educational philanthropists of Manchester have, we think, been unduly distressed by the number of children whom they see occasionally loitering at home, or ranging the fields, or running about the streets—or, to sum up all in one portentous phrase, “not at school.” This spectacle seems to frighten them out of their propriety, and their benevolent sorrow does not leave them cool judgment enough to form a just estimate of it. In this feeling Mr. Richson argues in Answer 45. “It is quite impossible,” he says, “to make the number attending school satisfactory,” because, take the facts any way you will, you will still find many thousand children “not attending school.” To affirm that in Manchester, Salford, and the townships, there are many thousand children who are “not at school,” seems to him to be stating a melancholy and

appalling fact, the effect of which would scarcely be mitigated, if it could be added that there were three times that number under the care of the pedagogue. Poor children! Who would not pity them, and not only provide schooling for them (which has been done already), but actually take them to school, if necessary, by the paternal hand of the policeman?

Stay, kind-hearted gentlemen; stay a moment. In no working population can it be reasonably expected that, in the working classes, more than one half of the children of school age should be simultaneously at school; and it follows from this that the other half are not to be expected there at the time of your observation. A practical and kindly consideration of the social and domestic elements of the case has led to this general conclusion; and it will not do for you to rush into this host of children, and, under pretence of philanthropy, to seize every little urchin you may find "not at school," as either guilty of a crime, or in a state of pitiable neglect.

Something may be done, however, towards showing that large numbers of those children who are not at school may be not badly accounted for. In the first place, many of them are at work. According to Table 11 from the Census office, nearly 15,000 children under 15 are "in employment" in the school district. Between 3 and 15, 40,000 are returned as "undescribed." Now, a considerable proportion of these are doubtless girls who have left school, and are helping their mothers at home, or are keeping house while their mothers work. Of course, the girls do not go to school as late as 15 years of age, and those engaged as above are not returned as "in employment." In the Table (No. 11) the girls above 10 years of age "undescribed" are 6,513; while the boys above 10 "undescribed" are only 3,736. Again, a very large proportion of the "undescribed" are between 3 and 6 years of age, and are probably thought by their parents too young to go to school. There are no less than 17,728 children above 3 and under 6 years of age "undescribed," whilst the return of "scholars" between those ages is only 8,722. The number, thus reduced at both ends, becomes by no means unmanageable. Many causes properly, and even necessarily, keeping children from school, will readily suggest themselves to every reader. Some, no doubt, are the victims of parental neglect or profligacy, of vagrant habits, or of destitution; but this is the proper field of active charity, not of legislation.

CHAPTER VIII.

MANCHESTER IN 1834 AND 1852.

Mr. Richson derives an argument, and one on which he lays considerable stress, from the fact, that school-attendance in Manchester, looked at for the last 17 years, although it has largely increased, has not kept pace with the increase of the population. The materials for the comparison implied in this statement are supplied by the labours of the Manchester Statistical Society, who published in 1835 some carefully prepared Tables. Placing them by the side of returns now obtained by himself, Mr. Richson has arrived at the following conclusion; that, while the population has increased 52 per cent., attendance at every kind of day-school has increased only 25

per cent., and the attendance at common elementary schools only $23\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In other words, in Manchester, Salford, and the Townships, in 1834, when the population was 255,000, there were attending day-schools of various classes 24,269; in 1852, the population being 390,872, there are but 30,344. (Table 24, p. 54.)

Upon this statement it may be observed, in the first place, that it affects but one part of the subject. The whole matter before us relates to two questions; if one is school attendance, another is school accommodation. Now it would not have been at all surprising, if, in a town increasing with such enormous and unprecedented rapidity as Manchester, the means of education should have been found continually falling behind the advancing population. This, however, is not the case. Of school accommodation there is, according to Mr. Richson's own testimony, enough, and more than enough, and he cordially renders due honour to the parties who have provided it. Upon this point, therefore, which is of primary importance and difficulty, there is no cause for regret. The educational energies of Manchester have borne satisfactorily even the severe test which the extraordinary increase of its population has applied to them.

The fact, then, as stated by Mr. Richson, is simply this, that "day-school attendance" has not kept pace with the population; in other words, that a smaller *proportion*—not, be it observed, a smaller *number*—of the children of the working classes go to school now than went 17 years ago.*

And here we make our second observation, namely, that Mr. Richson has greatly over-stated the fact. On the one hand it is quite an error to assume that an increase of population implies a proportionate increase of children. In manufacturing districts, and especially in Manchester, which is the centre of so large a portion of them, the population, as stated by Mr. Bright in question 1495, advances by large accessions of young men seeking employment, so that the adult increases perceptibly more rapidly than the juvenile population. It is consequently a mistake to say, that because the adult population has increased 52 per cent., those who require schools have increased 52 per cent. also. On the other hand, the rate of increase in day-school attendance has been considerably under-estimated by Mr. Richson. According to his own tables, (as Mr. Baines has shown, 1569 *et seq.*), that increase has been, not $23\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but $39\frac{1}{2}$, a very material difference. The tables supplied by the Census Office give a result still more favourable.

After making this correction, however, we are not prepared to deny the assertion that the number of day scholars has not increased in the same proportion as the juvenile population. Yet we do not see the pertinence of the question put by a member of the Committee in relation to this fact.

* It seems scarcely credible at the first moment, that day-school attendants in Manchester should, in 17 years, have increased only from 24,000 to 30,000, or consistent with the manifest earnestness and magnitude of its educational operations. The enigma is explained, however, by observing the relation between the public and the private schools. In 1834,5, there were at common, private, and dame schools (exclusive of superior schools) nearly 15,000 pupils; in 1852, but 5,000. In National, British, and Denominational Schools, in 1834, there were but about 5,000; in 1852, there are nearly 20,000. The public have to a great extent superseded the private schools, by the superiority of the education they have afforded. It is, nevertheless, a fact worth pondering, especially if it be a general fact, that two thirds of the energy and resources devoted to the formation and support of public schools have been expended on the extinction of private schools, and in so far in effecting a change for the worse, leaving us only the improvement of education itself for our reward.

1573. *Mr. Bright.*—Would not that lead you to the conclusion that, in the last 17 years, notwithstanding the meritorious efforts that have been made in Manchester those efforts have not been quite commensurate with the necessity of the case?

This question does not apply, since the means of education which have been provided are more than sufficient for the whole of this growing population. The allegation of Mr. Richson relates exclusively to school attendance, which, to a certain extent, is less in proportion to the population than it was 17 years since. There are obviously only two causes to which such a fact can be referred. Ample school accommodation being presupposed, the working classes are either less able, or less willing to avail themselves of it.

Mr. Richson would have us believe (as we shall see presently), that the working classes of Manchester are to a large extent too poor to send their children to school; but this consideration, whatever may be its truth, is not relevant here, since the question is not one of absolute, but of comparative condition. There were no doubt many very poor people in Manchester in 1834, as well as in 1852; and comparing the two periods, Mr. Richson does not assert, and there is certainly no reason to suppose, that there is a larger proportion of this class of persons in relation to the population at the latter period than there was at the former. There is nothing, consequently, in the element of poverty adapted to explain in any measure the falling off in attendance at day schools. The fact adduced is thus cut off altogether from Mr. Richson's argument, and we might spare ourselves the necessity of any further reference to it. We make, however, a few additional observations.

It remains to be supposed that the working classes of Manchester have shown themselves less inclined than they were in 1834, to improve the means of education within their reach. There can be no doubt that this is the fact, nor can there be any difficulty in accounting for at least a considerable portion of it. "In cities and towns of the magnitude of Manchester," says Mr. Baines (1447), "there is always a considerable number of the vagrant classes, who make it a temporary abode, and also of the criminal classes, who seek spoil and shelter among such masses of population and property." Another large portion of the population consists of the very lowest class, both of English and Irish, among whom the smallest conceivable appreciation of the value of education is to be found. Besides this, a very large portion of the multiplying population of Manchester consists, not of the labouring class merely, but of the manufacturing class, for whose *young* children the cotton mills furnish extraordinary means of remunerative employment. As Manchester has increased, all these causes have come into more powerful operation; and although the last of them has been somewhat modified by the Factories' act, the effects of it continue to come largely into the account. We think that a consideration of these and similar topics, may tend to show that the comparatively smaller attendance at day schools in Manchester in 1852 than in 1834, may fairly be resolved into causes not very mysterious, either in their character or their operation.

Whether we can solve this riddle or not, however, it remains to be asked, in what way does Mr. Richson propose to treat the fact he has brought forward? This is the practical question; and the whole value of his scheme depends upon the answer he can give to it. Let us then understand him.

1598. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Richson).*—Since there is so much surplus school accommodation, I take it that the only thing we want is to induce the attendance of children?

Ans.—I think so.

599. Do you think that making education gratuitous would have that effect ?

Ans.—Yes, if offered conditionally.

335. *Chairman.* What do you mean by “free education offered conditionally” ?

Ans.—On the condition of attendance.

We should rather say that this was offering it *unconditionally* ; but let this pass. In one word, Mr. Richson thinks the working classes generally, or even universally, would send their children to school if they had not to pay for it ; and therefore he proposes a system of free schools, to be supported by a rate.

Now, in the first place, even supposing that the schools were free, it is assuming, we think, a great deal too much, to suppose that this would draw all, or even a very large number, of the present absentees to school. The only classes of persons whom it would directly or powerfully influence, are those with whom the payment of the school pence operates as an impediment, either through extreme smallness of means, or through habits of profligacy causing an artificial poverty, both of which classes of persons are now out of our contemplation ; its beneficial effect on the careless or the unwilling (the class now before us) is very questionable, and can hardly be very large. What people do not care about, they will scarcely take the trouble—and sending children properly to school is always a matter of trouble—they will scarcely take the trouble to obtain, even when it can be had without money. Indeed, Mr. Richson himself elsewhere expresses much hesitation on this point.

83. *Mr Peto (to Mr. Richson).*—How would you secure under your* bill the attendance of the children ?

Ans.—That would be a matter which would require some little consideration. I believe the motives for attendance can be made manifold.

What these manifold motives may be he did not explain ; but this cautious reference to them demonstrates that the machinery of the bill cannot be considered as complete, and that the gratuitousness of the education to be offered by it is not relied upon as an adequate motive, even by its promoters themselves.

We know that we are not singular in holding this opinion. Although Mr. Richson may not share it with us, it is avowed by some of the prominent advocates, both of the local and the secular schemes ; and based upon it is their recorded declaration, that education must be made, not only tempting, as without cost, but compulsory, as permitting no refusal. This Mr. Richson said he should be sorry to see ; and when asked by the Chairman (2746) “Would you compel them to come to school ?” he answered distinctly, “Certainly not :” but both Mr. Entwisle and himself advocated “a certain sort of coercion,” such as a resolution of mill-owners to employ no uneducated hands (83) ; and there are doubtless others who would employ coercion in more direct and repulsive forms. This could be only a beginning. As a single measure its effect would be small, since, even if it were universally adopted by mill-owners, (of which there is, we presume, little prospect), it would affect only one class of the community, while there is every reason to believe it would not long be absolutely maintained. Mill-owners, like other tradesmen, must and will have the best working hands, whether educated or not. The mention of such a scheme is nothing more than a straw showing which way the stream runs, an indication that your

* Erroneously printed “a new bill.”

educational philanthropists are determined to carry their point, perhaps without force if they can, but by force if they must.

Mr. Richson himself, with his benevolent heart, does not seem to know where he is going. He is really too good for his company; and if his efforts should be successful, he may not improbably repent of his share in establishing a system of which the vital powers must be penalties and policeman.

We have, however, the capabilities of Mr. Richson's plan as estimated by himself.

2349. *Chairman (to Mr. Richson).*—Do you conceive, if it is only the indifference of the parents [that keeps children from school] that that indifference will be at all done away with by adopting the Manchester and Salford scheme?

Ans.—Yes, I think so. The more the children attend school the greater [more] the parents excite one another, and the greater the inducement they have to send them to school. More than that, upon the principle of a rate, if the working classes were compelled to pay their quota of the rate, I think that very fact would induce the father to send his child to school.

The first stimulus, a mutual excitement among parents as to the schooling of their children, it would be very pleasant to see in action, although we cannot see very clearly how the Manchester and Salford bill is to create it; but the second is the most singular mode of operation we ever heard of for a system of *gratuitous* education.

CHAPTER IX.

MANCHESTER COMPARED WITH OTHER TOWNS.

One point more, before concluding this part of the subject, we have to notice. It has been loudly asserted that Manchester is the worst educated place in England, and that you cannot compare it with any other, agricultural, commercial, or manufacturing, without perceiving its inferiority. On the face of it, one of the tables furnished by the Census office strongly confirms this representation, and much use was made of it for this purpose. It was quoted by Mr. Richson in his second examination (2393), and more particularly brought forward by one of the members of the Committee.

2531. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Adshead).*—Taking the Census returns as now presented to the House in their amended form, would you consider the state of education in Manchester satisfactory, when I call your attention to other districts in which education is in much greater proportion to the population; and when I state, that in the York district education prevails as 1 in 6·39; in Leeds as 1 in 8; in Hull as 1 in 8·6; in Liverpool as 1 in 8·26; in Birmingham 1 in 9·59; and in Manchester and Salford 1 in 11·60?

Ans.—I consider the ratio of education as presented in Table 11, Paper No. 2,* which is given as 1 in 9, as the return of the parents and heads of families, to be as satisfactory as we might expect in Manchester.

2532.—We find in the Census papers a table which seems to justify the statement made as to the comparative proportion of scholars to the population. It is headed, 'Day scholars in various large towns,' signed 'George Graham, Registrar General,' and we have a right to suppose that these calculations are correct?

Ans.—Certainly.

2533.—If it appears that the Manchester and Salford educational districts

* This table is in Appendix, No. 4.

only stand as 1 in 11·60, are the Committee to understand, after what you have stated, that you consider that is a good ratio for those to be educated?

Ans.—I am aware that in Paper No. 2, Table 17, 1 in 11·60 is given as the educational ratio of Manchester; but Table No. 11, also in Paper No. 2, gives 33,744 “scholars,” or a ratio of 1 in 9, which I should consider a fair ratio for a district like Manchester.*

We had the gratification of seeing this skirmish “come off,” and we were somewhat amused with the stubbornness of the respective combatants. As for Mr. Miles, he was evidently resolved upon victory, and he thought his ground impregnable when he found that his pet Table was actually “signed George Graham, Registrar General.” “We have a right to suppose these calculations correct,” he exclaimed, with an eye of triumph; and Mr. Adshead replied with becoming modesty, “Certainly.” But now, Mr. Miles, if you really *will* take the trouble to look at Table 11, you will find that that also is “signed George Graham, Registrar General,” and must consequently be supposed to be correct. Now the ratio of scholars to the population as given in that table actually is, as Mr. Adshead stated it, 1 in 9, or rather 1 in 8·75. You have, then, two returns, apparently inconsistent one with the other, and it is proper you should seek after some method of reconciling them. The truth is—and you will see it when you are cool enough to look after it—that Table 17 gives the number of “Day scholars,” or of children attending at day schools; while Table 11 gives the number of “scholars,” or of children under instruction. The former are as 1 in 11·60; the latter as 1 in 8·75. Your Table 17, therefore, upon which you relied so confidently, is utterly worthless and delusive.

CHAPTER X.

POVERTY IN MANCHESTER.

Assuming that he should triumphantly show a lamentable deficiency in the numbers under education in Manchester, Mr. Richson elaborately endeavours to demonstrate that poverty is, to a large extent, the cause of that deficiency; since, however, he has made out no alarming deficiency here, it might not be too much to say that his case breaks down in the outset, and that no revelations as to the poverty of the people of Manchester can remedy its fundamental weakness. We proceed, nevertheless, to examine what in this respect he has alleged.

It was, of course, a necessary and important part of Mr. Richson's duty, in making out a case for eleemosynary aid, to show how many persons, or what proportion of the population in the school district, were in circumstances to require it. This he has attempted to effect by the joint operation of two methods.

In the first place, by means of the assessors' books, he divides the assessments to the poor rate into various classes; the gist of this division being to show how many houses are assessed at less than £18 a year, which turn out to be 86 per cent. of the whole, (6). From the houses he

* The ratio is about the same if you take the whole school district, the scholars in which are returned at 44,598.

advances to the population, assigning 5 persons to each house; and thus he obtains the number of persons residing in houses assessed under £18, which he states at 336,149. The value of the number so arrived at consists in this, that Mr. Richson assumes that people residing in houses assessed under £18 are "in a class of life to avail themselves of common elementary schools," (33). The children within the school age, or between 3 and 15, belonging to this portion of the inhabitants he sets down at 84,566. The assumption just stated was put to a practical test by an examination of 23 schools, from which it resulted that, in 1276 families, 6 per cent. of the children resided in houses assessed above £18 a year.

One step was thus made, and the class of persons likely to avail themselves of common elementary schools was ascertained. Not all these, however, would require educational alms; consequently, a further step was taken, which Mr. Richson himself shall describe.

We were not satisfied with this form of return alone, he says, because we thought, if we could ascertain the incomes of the parents of the children attending the different schools, we should still nearer approach the condition in life of the children attending the schools; accordingly, through the agency of some of the teachers, we obtained the income of 777 families, in connexion with 12 schools. . . . I found 12 per cent. whose income was under 10s. a week; 41 per cent. nearly, 10s. and under 20s.; $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. 20s. and under 30s.; $15\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. 30s. and under 50s.; $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. 50s. and under 60s.; and $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. above 60s. a week. . . . That is, of the 777 families, there were 95 that were under 10s.; there were 103 that were from 10s. to 15s.; 215 from 15s. to 20s.; 126 from 20s. to 25s.; 87 from 25s. to 30s.; 85 from 30s. to 40s.; 37 from 40s. to 50s.; 12 from 50s. to 60s.; and 17 above 60s., (12, 13, 16).

Such were the facts which were ascertained, and which formed the basis of Mr. Richson's calculation, and of the significance of which he spoke with great confidence when previously questioned by a member of the Committee.

12. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Richson).*—Will you just explain to the Committee the data on which you have formed the opinion that for those below £18,* it will be necessary to provide education?

Ans.—I think I can show that to the Committee most conclusively.

In a subsequent answer (73) to Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Richson stated that what we have given above were "the only data" on which he proceeded. The reader shall now be informed of the conclusion at which he arrived.

The conclusion I arrived at is this: that, at the very lowest estimate we could make as to the children who would use these common elementary schools, we must include all those residing in houses assessed under £18 a year; and hence I have assumed that such a proportion of the population as reside in houses [assessed] under £18 a year, or rather the children of that population, is the proportion of children for whom we ought to provide education, (16).

We confess ourselves greatly embarrassed by this answer, inasmuch as it contains nothing relevant to the matter under investigation. All it states is Mr. Richson's conviction, that "all those residing in houses assessed under £18 a year *would use the common elementary schools*;" but this we have had before, in answer 12. That which Mr. Richson is now inquiring after, is the proportion of this population who *may be*

* Erroneously printed "*above £15 or below.*"

regarded as requiring pecuniary aid in educating their children ; but upon this point the answer tells us absolutely nothing. In this dilemma we have referred again to notes (perfectly trustworthy) of the examination taken at the time, and there we find the answer given as follows :—

The conclusions I have arrived at were these, that the very lowest estimate we could make, as to the children who would use these common elementary schools, [and require pecuniary aid], is 75 per cent. [of those] residing in houses [assessed] under £18 a year ; and therefore it was necessary to consider such a proportion of the population who reside in houses [assessed] under £18 a year, or rather the children of that population, as the proportion of children for whom we ought to provide education.

The answer thus given is relevant to its object, and supplies the information required. We can only suppose, that in the correction of the proof, Mr. Richson's attention was accidentally diverted from the immediate scope of his statement, and presume that he will thank us for supplying a lapsed element of vital importance to his case. We shall now proceed as if the answer which we have supplied, and in which we have interpolated a few words obviously required by the sense, were actually in its proper place in the blue book.

Some light is thrown upon the manner in which Mr. Richson arrived at his conclusion by the following questions and answers.

74. *Mr. Gladstone (to Mr. Richson).*—What income do you think places a family above the need of any eleemosynary assistance ?

Ans.—I think if they have more than £1 a week they can provide education for themselves.

75. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Would you not put down less than £1 a week ?

Ans.—Yes, in my own private opinion.

76. At what amount of wages would you, in your own private capacity, say that a person should send his children to school ?

Ans.—I do not know that I can fix that ; it is mere matter of private opinion.

77. Surely you have formed an opinion upon that point ?

Ans.—It will depend, of course, upon the number of children. It is a difficult question to answer.

Mr. Richson here acknowledges that he had formed no opinion as to the amount of wages which ought to be considered sufficient to enable parents to pay for the schooling of their children, and yet he had set himself to calculate from a table of wages, the number of those who could not do so ! This was evidently calculating without any principle to guide him ; it was guessing, and guessing in the dark. One is somewhat curious to know what can have been the result of such an operation.

“The very lowest estimate” which Mr. Richson “could make,” was that 75 per cent. of those residing in houses assessed below £18 would require eleemosynary aid. Here it is, of course, fair and necessary to extend to the whole of this population the rates of wages which he had ascertained to exist in the 777 families his agents had visited. Now, upon referring to the table of wages, we find that, beginning from the lowest, 75 per cent. of them includes all rates up to 25s. a week, and more than half of those from 25s. to 30s. To our astonishment at such a calculation we shall give no utterance ; that it is worthless must be too obvious to need affirmation.

In presenting the substance of the first division of his evidence in the form of conclusions (69), Mr. Richson brings up this subject in a

somewhat different form. Speaking of the 27,000 children now attending common elementary schools, he says "that nearly two fifths of the children attending these schools are such as do not need eleemosynary assistance in procuring education." We do not see how this new proportion of "nearly two fifths" is obtained. If 75 per cent., as previously asserted, do want aid, there can be only 25 per cent., or one fourth, who do not want it. Let us take it, however, as it is given, and say that three fifths, instead of three fourths, of the children now at school require educational charity. This ratio, of course, may be extended to those not at school—*a fortiori*, indeed, since those who do not attend are assumed to be poorer than those who do. We have only now to stretch our thoughts from the children to the parents—from the 84,566 children to the 336,149 inhabitants whom educationally they represent—and we shall arrive at the proportion of the population whom Mr. Richson contemplates as in need of charity. Three fifths of 336,149 is 201,634. Let our readers now hear Mr. Baines.

It is then, says Mr. Baines, the deliberate opinion of the promoters of this bill, that 201,634 of the inhabitants of Manchester and Salford 'need eleemosynary assistance in procuring education.' It cannot be necessary to characterize such an opinion; but it may be permitted to ask the Committee to reflect on the light which it throws on the project itself, and on the consequences to society if Parliament should listen to gentlemen whose benevolence seems quite to have blinded their judgment. Our experience of the old poor law ought to be a solemn warning against these new methods of pauperizing the community, (1558).

In his second examination, Mr. Richson confesses his admiration of the acuteness of Mr. Baines's criticism, and he does his best to evade it; with what success our readers shall judge.

I beg to say, he replies, that I have not ventured to express an opinion whether these 201,634 inhabitants of Manchester and Salford do or do not require aid in procuring education. . . I repeat the assertion that two fifths of the children attending these schools are such as do not require eleemosynary assistance. *I express no opinion of the remainder*, (2391).

The reader is certainly startled, as the Committee were, by the last sentence in this extract. It forces upon us the conviction that its author did not go to College for nothing. He is clearly a master of evasive logic. He "*expressed* no opinion of the remainder." No: but his statement *implied* one. Conceive him addressing a company of persons thus.—'Two fifths of you are honest men; I express no opinion of the remainder.' Would 'the remainder' judge that no aspersion was cast upon their integrity? We feel sure that, upon consideration, Mr. Richson must be ashamed of this evasion, especially if he should read over again those passages of his evidence which we have quoted at the beginning of this chapter. For ourselves, however, we can wish nothing better than that the rev. gentleman should be taken at his word; since it will then follow, that he had been devising a vast scheme of educational charity for persons of whose condition in life he had "expressed," and of course, had formed "no opinion!" As pretty a piece of Utopianism, we think, as has been exhibited in modern times.

On the third day of Mr. Richson's examination, the question of the rate of wages was thus resumed.

492. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—You stated some particulars as to 777 families.

Ans. Yes.

493. I understood you to say that there were 95 earning under 10s. a week, that 103 were earning from 10s. to 15s. a week, that 215 were earning from 15s. to 20s. a week ; in fact, that 413 out of 777 were earning less than 20s. a week. Seeing that those persons receiving so little can, and do, send their children to school, is it fair to assume that poverty, understood in any fair sense, really keeps the children from school in those families ?

Ans. Decidedly. In my opinion, I think that when a family is reduced to 10s. a week, it is quite as incumbent upon the public to assist that family with education, as it is to assist them with the means of obtaining food ; for under such circumstances, I suppose it very likely that the guardians of the poor would not object to give out-door relief, if the parties had a family.

Our readers will, perhaps, be able to contrast the emphatic decision of Mr. Richson's opinion upon this occasion with his singular hesitancy on a former one. They will notice also the lower rate of wages to which he attaches himself ; then it was 20s. a week, now it is 10s. At this point he becomes very firm. Even the heart of a guardian of the poor he expects would melt here. We ourselves will readily admit, that when persons are so poor as to need assistance in obtaining food, they must need assistance also in getting education. But is this the light in which persons earning 10s. a week are regarded ? In his first examination Mr. Richson cautiously hinted, but with some embarrassment, that it might "very likely" be so ; but, on his re-appearance before the Committee he fully acknowledged his error. "I have ascertained," said he, "since my previous examination, that families in the receipt of 8s. or 10s. a week, except under very peculiar circumstances, are never permitted to receive out-door relief," (2387).

This sort of argument, however, is obviously open to the general answer, that the amount of weekly income is only one out of many elements by which the economical condition of a family is determined. A small family will be as rich on 10s. a week as a large one upon 20s. ; and a large one with frugal habits may be as rich on the smaller sum as a small one with extravagant habits on the larger. The mere amount of income proves nothing to Mr. Richson's point. But not to insist on this, the case was well stated by Mr. Baines, in the following passage of his evidence :—

In the agricultural counties, said Mr. Baines, I believe, the wages of adult labourers are from 7s. to 10s. a week, and very little is earned by the wife or children. Yet at this time, throughout England, the working classes are paying for the education of their children, and the proportion of children at school is higher in the agricultural than in the manufacturing counties, (1535.)

So much for the matter of fact, that families having an income of only 10s. a week are not really too poor to educate their children. As to Mr. Richson's proposal that they shall be considered too poor, its benevolence is absolutely quixotic. The reverend gentleman cannot, of course, intend to confine his new economical principle to Manchester. If it be applicable at all, it must be applicable to all England : and thus applied, it would be about the most uncalled for, unwise, and pernicious exercise of public charity ever devised. If, indeed, it be "incumbent on the public" to assist with the pecuniary means of education every family not earning more than 10s. a week, "the public" (by whom Mr. Richson means the rate-payers) will have work enough.

At a subsequent period of his examination Mr. Richson made another and an elaborate attempt, to prove that a very large proportion of the working classes of Manchester are unable to pay for their children's schooling. This is to be found in Table 29. This table professes to give the alleged causes of absence from school in 17,426 families, as ascertained by inquiry "from house to house"—a phrase which misled Mr. Adshead in his examination of the table, and which Mr. Richson afterwards admitted to be incorrect. The fact is, that 17,426 families selected as containing children between 3 and 15, were visited; they were found to include 36,527 children within the ages specified; more than 22,000 of these were reported as not attending school, and the absence of 12,067 was alleged to arise from poverty. This, no doubt, appears to be an affecting case; but let the reader cheer up, for it is not what it appears.

We dispose of this table in the following manner. The total number of children between 3 and 15 being 36,527, the number who ought to be at school is 18,263, or one half. Now there were found attending school 14,197, leaving only 4066 to be accounted for. It is clearly impossible, therefore, that there should have been 12,067 children really absent from poverty; even if the whole balance of the moiety were assigned to this cause, the number would be but one third of this. Other causes of absence, however, are stated to have operated. Independently of 5,153 who were at work, 4,309 were absent from sickness, indifference of parents, being thought too young, and causes unnamed; and it is clearly but fair to allot a proportion of these to the 4,066 to be accounted for. If we say but 1,400 for this item, there will then remain only 2,666 absences from alleged poverty, instead of 12,067. The fallacy which vitiates this table (as it does many of Mr. Richson's) is, that the table is constructed as though not the half, but the whole, of the children within the assumed school age were to be at school.*

* We have a palpable example of this in the following passage.

It appears, says Mr. Richson, that out of the population there are 5,277 who are attending superior schools. The total number of children we assumed as residing in houses [assessed] above £18, was 14,664. Now that we have taken too many here will, I think, be very evident, as we can find in the superior schools in Manchester only 5,277 children, . . . and we require to find what becomes of 9,387 of these children; they must either go out of Manchester to school, *or belong to a lower class*, because these children exist somewhere, (37).

According to Mr. Richson, it seems that "these children" must not only all "exist," but all be at school. The existence of children of the higher classes anywhere but "at school" seems to be quite beyond his conception. He does not even recollect that some thousands of them in Manchester are under private tuition.

Mr. Monsell, a member of the Committee, indulged himself in the same fallacy in his treatment of the Census, during the examination of Mr. Baines.

It appears by those returns, said he, that in the districts of Manchester and Salford there are a little more than 76,000 children between the ages of 5 and 15, and that the number of scholars attending school on the 31st of March was 22,488. Must there not therefore be a very large number of children indeed in those districts at present without any education? (1875.)

And with this question (we were present, and saw what we state) Mr. Monsell put into Mr. Baines's hand a document from the Census Office which he had never seen, and which he had then no time to examine—an unfairness to which Mr. Bright very properly adverted. Mr. Baines, however, with much penetration and tact, suggested several facts and considerations greatly modifying the intended inference of Mr. Monsell; but he did not state (it was more

It may be reiterated that in 12,067 cases of absence poverty was actually "alleged" as the reason. We do not question this; but we are convinced that the investigators by no means arrived at the real, or at the whole truth. Nothing is easier than to give such an answer, which, for its convenient plausibility, and its tendency to obstruct further, and perhaps unwelcome inquiry, may have been given in many cases where it was much rather a pretext, than a reason. Where, indeed, is the guarantee for its truth? And what, it may be asked, is its meaning? What is being too poor to send one's children to school? And if even such poverty were palpable, questions might still be put respecting both its causes and its cure. Upon this subject we extract the following evidence.

310. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—Did the agents you employed ascertain in all those families what was the amount of income the families possessed?

Ans.—No, they could not.

311. Then they merely put down in their note book the general and very obvious excuse which was made, in many cases, that they could not afford to send them?

Ans.—That they could not afford to pay.

314. But you might go into two or three houses standing together, and have poverty alleged as the reason why certain children in each of those houses did not go to school: in the first house you might find that half the children, or two out of four, were at school; in another that two were sent to school for six months, and the other two for the next six months; in another you might find that one out of three went to school, or that one out of three was at home; in the next you might find that none of the children went to school, and that the poverty of the parents, or the sickness of the parents it might be, made it impossible for them to pay; but in another house you might find that the dissipation of the father, or the ignorance of the mother, or a disregard for education, might be the real cause. Therefore, you would not, I presume, endeavour to lead the Committee to believe that that plea of poverty, generally and broadly, can be accepted as the real reason why all these children were not at school?

Ans.—I think there is great truth in the statements which were made. Those visits having been made chiefly in the day time, the mothers would be the persons seen, and I believe there would be great truth generally in the statement, when they said 'We cannot afford to pay;' and for this reason, that even in the cases where the father is dissipated, and refuses to pay the amount of the school fee, the mother would be anxious to send the child to school, but cannot get the fee necessary from the father in order to do so.

Such then is Mr. Richson's own account of the plea of poverty, that it was in many instances assigned by the sorrowful wives of dissipated men, who were able enough to supply the school pence, only not willing to spare the amount from their debauch. And this was explicitly admitted by him in a subsequent part of his examination.

497. *Mr. Bright.*—In the great majority of cases where that impediment [inability to pay the school pence] does exist, it arises from the poverty of the parents?

Ans.—I do not say that it arises from the poverty of the parents in the sense of a parent being a pauper; but that, either from poverty itself, arising from ill health, insufficient work, or insufficient wages, or from the intemperate or

obvious at the moment, perhaps, to lookers on than to himself) that the entire force of Mr. Monsell's question lies in assuming that the whole 76,000 children ought to be at school. Now, if instead of 76,000, we take the half, or 38,000, the case at once loses its terrors; while, as Mr. Baines shows, instead of 22,448, the number of children at school ought to be stated as 26,300, and the children at work, and those between 13 and 15, a period during which no children of the working classes are at school, ought not to be included in the calculation at all.

other immoral habits of the father, or from various other causes which induce poverty, the parent does not send the child to school, either because he has not the means, or because he will not spare the amount to pay the school fees.

And the latter class are persons whom Mr. Richson considers so far justified in using the plea of poverty in bar of sending their children to school, that he proposes to establish a grand system of public charity for their relief, and for attaching a bounty to their habits of intemperance and profligacy!

After this exhibition of the views of Mr. Richson as a social economist, it will not be difficult to appreciate his general statements as to the effect of poverty on school-attendance. Thus upon one occasion—

237. *Lord J. Russell (to Mr. Richson).*—To what is it that you attribute the nonattendance at the schools of a great number of children in Manchester, seeing that there is a great amount of surplus accommodation? Is it to their poverty, or any other cause?

Ans.—Mainly to their inability to pay the school pence. I think I can show that.

Again:

485. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—You said on your previous examination that you believed that poverty was, in the vast majority of cases, the reason why the children who did not attend school were absent?

Ans.—Yes, I did.

Again:

265. *Mr. Gladstone (to Mr. Richson).*—Are there any districts in Manchester in which there are a very large number of parents that could not contribute anything?

Ans.—I should doubt if there is a very large number that could not contribute anything.

626. What are the lowest payments made at present?

Ans.—A penny per week.

627. Do you think that there is any considerable portion of the population of Manchester who are not able to pay 1d. per week?

Ans.—I look at the question not as it affects their ability, but also as it affects their willingness. *In a large number of instances the father or mother will not spare the money.*

An excellent reason, Mr. Richson, no doubt, for giving it them out of a public fund, but a total abandonment, so far, of your plea of poverty.

Another argument for his scheme of educational charity Mr. Richson finds in the allegation which he makes, that, “for some cause or other, a very small proportion” of the poorer class is found attending common elementary schools, (69).

Now, if the fact really were as Mr. Richson states it, no inference could be drawn from it as to the effect of poverty in giving occasion to it, inasmuch as the poorer classes are subject to the operation of many other causes from which the same result may ensue. In this case, however, the fact is really not so, Mr. Richson himself being witness. He brings forward a table (Table 22) showing, among other things, “the average school attendance in common elementary schools, in registrar’s districts classified according to the extent of poverty therein.” In No. 1, “in which the largest proportion of poor reside,” the day school attendance is 1 in 14 of the population; in No. 2, “medium proportion,” the attendance is 1 in 17; and in No. 3, “smallest proportion,” the attendance is 1 in 15. It thus

appears, on evidence presented by himself, that, comparing the districts of Manchester one among another in respect of their poverty, school attendance is greater, rather than less, in the poorest. And again, the average period of school attendance is higher in the poorest districts, than it is in the whole population living in houses assessed under £18 a year. Mr. Richson estimates this population as yielding 84,566 children, and 29,077 of them as attending school, so that we have an average length of schooling for the whole of four years and six weeks. Now in the "pauper districts" treated of in Table 29, of 36,527 children between 3 and 15, there were attending school 14,197; which gives an average schooling of 4 years and 14 weeks.

Thus, says Mr. Baines, the children in the very poorest districts of Manchester, whatever plea of poverty may be made, are found actually attending school eight weeks longer on the average than the whole of the children living in houses assessed under £18 a year. That single fact, proved by the promoters themselves, seems to me to be fatal to this bill, (1534).

Somewhat galled, as it would seem, by this remark, and by the pointed but just notice taken by Mr. Baines of his confused and contradictory answers in relation to this topic (1533), Mr. Richson attempted in his second examination an elaborate, but we think unsuccessful reply (2387). At the close of it he defines what he meant by "the poorest classes," which turn out to be, first, those who are actually receiving out-door relief, and secondly, those who are "scarcely able" to do without it. Why, that "a small proportion" of the children of *these* classes should be at school is natural enough, and the assertion presents nothing to quarrel with; but Mr. Richson has done nothing to show that "a large proportion" of the 57,000 children who do not attend school belong to *these* classes, nor do we believe that such is the fact. Be the fact as it may, however, it remains demonstrated by himself, that there is quite as large a proportion of children at school in the poorest classes of Manchester, as there is in the whole population residing in houses assessed at and under £18 a year; and the conclusion is thus fairly warranted, that the allegation of poverty can do little towards explaining the alleged low state of education in Manchester.

As affording an argument auxiliary to his proof of poverty, Mr. Richson exhibits a table (Table 25) compiled from the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors, displaying the fluctuations in day school attendance. These are well known to be large and trying, but the fact contributes little, we think, to Mr. Richson's design. At first he seemed willing to have it believed that, in his opinion, this fluctuation arose wholly from "the inability of the parents to pay the school pence," since he assigned no other cause, and negatived one suggested by the Committee; at length, however, we have the following answer.

261. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Richson).*—Therefore you have every reason to come to the conclusion that it is their poverty that prevents their attendance?

Ans.—I attribute the fluctuation to three causes. First, inability to pay the school pence; secondly, unwillingness to pay when the child from any cause may be detained from school one or two days in the week; and thirdly, (resulting from the former) the habit of capriciously changing schools.

Thus, therefore, this fluctuation of attendance is very far from throwing its whole weight into Mr. Richson's argument, since only a portion of it, and that an indefinite portion, is, by his own showing, to be ascribed to the inability of parents to pay the weekly pence. We may add, however, that,

in our judgment, even such inability of parents to pay the weekly pence as may be thus indicated is but a very equivocal proof of their poverty. In a large number of instances it might with much greater probability be traced to habits of extravagance or intemperance, and in many more to a momentary pressure, from sickness or other causes, widely different from a state of general poverty.

CHAPTER XI.

POVERTY IN MANCHESTER, CONTINUED.

The following important evidence on this subject was given by Mr. Baines.

1606. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).*—You have already observed, that Mr. Richson stated a strong opinion with regard to the want of education arising from the poverty of the population: is it your opinion that, at present and in past times, the working classes of Manchester, and the population generally, have been in the habit of wasting some considerable portion of their income? I allude particularly to habits of intemperance, which are observable among many; and do you think that, on that point, there is an improvement taking place, and that the working population have, therefore, more means at their disposal for educating their children?

Ans.—I cannot doubt that there is a very great waste of the means of the working classes of Manchester in intemperance, and that that waste is to such an extent as clearly to prove that it is not poverty that prevents them from educating their children. Mr. Stephen Neale, the chief constable of Salford, published a report in 1851, in which he estimated that, in the 2,037 public-houses and beer-houses of the two boroughs, £4,074 was spent every Saturday night, which would amount to £211,848 a year. He supposes that each frequenter of those houses may spend 2s. on the average on the Saturday night in liquor. If we take for granted that even this amount were thus squandered during the whole week, how vain is it to argue that the working classes are too poor to pay 2d. 4d. or 6d. a week for the education of their children.

1607. If so large a sum is expended, is not that one main cause of the poverty on which Mr. Richson so much dwelt in his evidence?

Ans.—It must be so.

1608. And does not that afford some ground for his statement, that the means for educating children are not forthcoming, and that it might be desirable to adopt some other mode of helping them?

Ans.—I do not see how the latter conclusion follows, that it is desirable to adopt some other mode of helping them. I see that, as long as the habits of intemperance last, they will stand in the way of education.

1609. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Looking at the number of children that, from the intemperate habits of their fathers, must naturally be left without education, what would you do with those children?

Ans.—I cannot answer that question as to what I would do with those children. Nature teaches us that children must, and do everywhere, suffer for the vices of their parents. It is the foundation of Bishop Butler's great argument in his "Analogy," that children do suffer for the vices of their parents, and must inevitably.

1610. If, as is stated in the report a part of which you have read, so many children must be left without education owing to the vices of their parents, their parents not undertaking those natural duties which belong to them, is it,

or not, the duty of the state or the community to step in, and rescue those children from that poverty and want of education which the vices of their parents engender ?

Ans.—No, I do not think it is.

1611. *Mr. Bright.*—The question of the Honourable Member for Somersetshire referred to what the state is to do, or to what the community is to do through the state ; in your answer, did you mean to say that you think it is nobody's duty to take any care of the unhappy children who are found neglected by their parents ?

Ans.—On the contrary, I believe it is everybody's duty.

1612. *Mr. Brotherton.*—Do they perform that duty ?

Ans.—Many do. There are Temperance Societies ; there are City Missions, Scripture Readers, and all sorts of societies and efforts, religious, moral, and social, that can be conceived, at this time at work in the city of Manchester.

1613. *Mr. Bright.*—Are the Committee merely to understand that you do not think it the duty of the community, acting as the state, by means of the law, to undertake all the duties which the parents neglect ?

Ans.—That is what I mean.

1614. At the same time you would enjoin upon all persons having the welfare of their fellow-creatures at heart, to take such means by their own organization as they can to remedy the misfortunes to which these children are liable ?

Ans.—That fully expresses my meaning.

1615. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Would you recommend that this should be done by individual effort, or by persons forming themselves into a society for the rescue of these unfortunate children ?

Ans.—Both ; as it is at present. There are very many benevolent individuals who exert themselves in that way now, and many organizations of a benevolent kind, and of a moralizing kind, now in existence, such as those I have referred to ; such as temperance societies and town missions.

1616. Still, all those societies which you have referred to in your answers to the Honourable Member for Manchester, have regard to ameliorating the condition of the parents, and instilling into them better views and better morals : but, according to my understanding of the matter, they do not touch the state of their children, and until you have greatly rectified the condition of the parents, of course, you can have no kind of influence upon their children ?

Ans.—Except indirectly. The direct influence is upon the parents, but the case of the children also is contemplated distinctly by several of these societies. For example, with regard to the Town Mission, and the Scripture Readers which are connected with the Church of England and with other religious bodies, it is one of their distinct objects to draw the children, both to the day schools and to the Sunday schools. The last report of the City Mission presents an account of the vast number of children, actually taken to day schools and Sunday schools by the City Missionaries. There are 72 of these, independently of the organization of the Church of England, which is also a very powerful one. There are 72 city missionaries continually traversing the worst parts of the city of Manchester, and they are not only paying attention to the parents by reading the scriptures to them, and addressing to them religious observations, but they are also endeavouring, wherever they find the children do not attend a day school or a Sunday school, to induce the parents to send them.

1617. From what funds are the payments made for these children, if the parents are stimulated to send them ?

Ans. From the parents ; it is not that the parents are unable to do it, but they neglect it.

1618. Still, I suppose there must be a great number of parents, when you have done all, either by visits, or through moral influence, who still refuse to send their children to school, and to pay their pence or twopence a week, as the case may be ?

Ans. I am not aware to what extent that is so. I presume there must be some ; I hope the number is very rapidly diminishing.

1619. *Chairman.*—As to temperance societies, your argument, I presume, is this : that if they prevail upon a man not to spend his money in drinking, he will have so much more to pay for his children, and it may end in his sending the children to school ?

Ans. Yes.

1620. *Marquis of Blandford.*—Is it not your opinion, that, if a rate were levied in order to give free education to the children of the poor, the possible effect of that might be to relieve the parents' minds of a sense of duty to provide for their children themselves, and so far, perhaps, to confirm them in this wasteful expenditure of money to which you have just alluded in the public-houses ?

Ans. I think that that is not an improbable effect.

As to this allegation of poverty, however, Mr. Richson may be confronted with his own testimony. A question was skilfully put by Mr. Bright, with a view to ascertain whether the proportion of children not at school was greater among the Irish part of the population of Manchester, than among the other portions of it ; and to this Mr. Richson answered as follows :—

250. In little Ireland, almost a Roman Catholic colony, after a careful investigation of that district, we found a very much larger proportion of children at school than in almost any other district of the same size.

251. *Mr. Cobden.*—In Sunday schools ?

Ans. In week-day schools.

252. *Mr. Bright.*—Is it not the fact, that that portion of the working population of Manchester which is Irish and Roman Catholic is generally supposed to be, in outward circumstances, as to employment and wages, in an inferior position to the rest of the working population ?

Ans. The proportion of out-door paupers to the population, which is a pretty good criterion, is rather greater, as I understood, among the Irish than the English.

252. Would not it lead to the conclusion, that, if amongst the Irish population of Manchester, quite as large a number are at school on the week days as among any other portion of the population, (and the Irish are poorer than the other classes,) it is not poverty which is the main reason why so large a number of children do not attend school ?

Ans.—There may be another way besides this of dealing with the question. The children may be received in schools without paying the same amount of pence ; besides which report says, I do not know whether correctly or not, that the Roman Catholics are making much greater efforts to support their schools than any other body of Christians.

Why, then, we beg to ask, should not other bodies of Christians imitate them ? With all their poverty, they have not, it seems, (254) had recourse to Mr. Richson's nostrum of free schools.

The allegation of poverty as a characteristic of the working classes of Manchester was by Mr. Adshead, an unquestionable authority on this point, directly denied. Speaking of self-supporting schools, he was asked the following question :—

2103. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Adshead).*—There may be districts in which it would not be worth while for an independent schoolmaster to settle down ?

Ans. In the densely populated districts, I am not aware that the state of our population in Manchester is such that they cannot pay for the education of their children at a low rate.

2104. That observation, I presume, you apply to the poor districts ?

Ans.—I make it as a general remark.

A considerable portion of Mr. Adshead's evidence has an immediate relation to this subject. He introduced it with the following general observation.

2252. I have ventured to think, that with the question of the education of the operative classes, their social condition is very intimately connected ; forming, as it should, a very important element in the consideration of those who would promote education by legislative enactment, the necessity for which is maintained by them on the ground of the inability of the operative classes to pay for education—a principle [which is] not sustained, and I venture to think cannot be shown [sustained], by the present condition of the operatives of Manchester.

Mr. Adshead then made statements showing, 1, a considerable increase in the rate of wages ; 2, a considerable decrease in the price of provisions ; 3, a large accumulation of deposits in the Manchester Savings' Bank ; 4, a large diminution in the amount of out-door relief ; 5, a great decrease of crime : and after the presentation of this mass of information, for the details of which we must refer to the evidence itself, the following question is put to him :—

2254. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Do you conceive, looking at the good condition of the people of Manchester, from the tables that have been produced to the Committee, that this is the time for the state to step in *in loco parentis*, and take from the parents themselves that duty which they owe to themselves and their offspring, of finding them education ?

Ans.—I consider that it is not the time for the state to step in.

Mr. Richson, in his second examination—he was particularly fortunate in having a second examination—said he did not think much of Mr. Adshead's argument, which is very probable, and he made objections to some of Mr. Adshead's statements, which, we dare say, had partial justice in them ; but he did not attempt to show, in opposition to Mr. Adshead, that the present condition of the operative classes in Manchester was one of peculiar depression and difficulty. He knew that “the better part of valour is discretion.”

Manchester is, in truth, the very last place in England in which poverty should be pleaded as a bar to education, as some members of the Committee seemed to be perfectly aware.

1469. *Mr. Ker Seymer (to Mr. Baines).*—The wages of able-bodied operatives in the manufacturing districts are higher than the wages of agricultural labourers, are they not ?

Ans.—Very much higher.

1470. Then supposing it to be the duty of the parents to afford those children the means of obtaining a good education, those parents, being so well paid, have a better opportunity of performing that duty ?

Ans.—Yes.

Why, then, should either the legislature, or the philanthropists, force charity upon them ?

CHAPTER XII.

MR. RICHSON'S SYSTEM OF POOR RELIEF.

It has become sufficiently evident, we trust, that Mr. Richson has no less egregiously failed in substantiating a case for charity, than he did in making out a deficiency of education; but we are willing to give up even this position, and to contest the matter with him on the next ground which may be taken. For the sake of argument, we will grant him all the poverty in the school district, the existence of which he has endeavoured to show; and then we ask him, what is his remedy? His answer is, a grand educational charity.

Now, in the first place, we do not think that a mere educational charity would meet the case.

A suggestion was made by a member of the Committee on this subject, the force of which Mr. Richson evidently felt.

324. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson)*—If those children are really kept away by the poverty of their parents, it may be presumed that their condition in other respects, that their clothing, for instance, would be in very bad order; and from such a circumstance as that, is it not likely, even if you offered to pay for the schooling of all those children, that still a large number of them would be prevented from attending?

Ans.—Very likely some would be so prevented.

325. Then the substitution of the plan which you propose, of rates instead of the present scheme, would only very partially fill up the void where there is really a deficiency?

Ans.—I think anything that increases school-attendance—for instance, the improved quality of the education—will act as a lever upon the whole mass, and eventually bring them in greater numbers to school than they come now. The object that we have in view, however, is not merely to offer free education; but I allude to these circumstances to show that the parents of the children state that poverty is the occasion of their children not attending school.

If we understand this rightly, Mr. Richson here not only gives up, to a great extent, the attractive influence of gratuitous education upon the poor, but actually throws overboard the allegation of poverty itself. We have hitherto had the strongest assertions that the non-attendance at school was mainly owing to poverty, and that a vast system of charitable education was demanded, and would be effectual: now, we are informed that the allegation of poverty was brought forward, not to prove that the parties were really poor, but to show what the parents of non-attendant children said; and it is admitted that the real attractiveness of the new system is to be, not in its charity, but in “the improved quality of the education,” and other things not specified.

In the second place, whatever might be the efficacy of charity, the plan advocated by Mr. Richson shows none of it. He talks, indeed, of supplying education without charge, and harps upon the phrase “Free schools,” as though it were a talisman, adapted as by magic to disarm all opposition. Alas! it is but a cheat. Free schools? Who then pays the rate? The poor. Aye, THE POOR! For, although, as to houses rated under £10, the landlord is the party assessed, he always charges it to the tenant in the

shape of an addition to the rent. On this subject let us hear Mr. Entwisle.

764. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Entwisle).*—As I understand, the owners, and not the occupiers, up to £10, pay the rates. Is that so?

Ans.—I believe that is the fact.

765. But all tenements pay the rates if down in the rate-book, do they not, either the owner or the occupier?

Ans.—Of course.

766. If the owner pays the rate, does he not lay it on in the shape of rent to the occupier?

Ans.—There is no doubt that the rate so paid by the owner does form an element in that for which the rent is paid.

767. Though a poor Irish person may actually not pay the rate, he pays more than an equivalent for that rate in rent, does he not?

Ans.—I am unable to see why it should be more than an equivalent.

768. Or say an equivalent?

Ans.—That might be so possibly, if it were now to be started for the first time: but I can mention to the Committee, that a very influential deputation of the owners of cottage property in Manchester waited upon the Committee of the Association with which I am connected, to represent the impossibility on their part of increasing their rents, by even the fractional amount of any additional rates to be levied; and that cheaper bricks, and cheaper timber, and various means of constructing houses now more cheaply than they were before, would make it very difficult to enable them to raise their rents, without driving away all their tenants.

Here the cat is let completely out of the bag. “The owners of cottage property in Manchester”—doubtless a charitable body of men, but deeming it right to be just as well as charitable—no sooner find the project of an additional rate upon the tapis than they commence their arrangements for raising their rents; and the owners of the *older* cottage property, finding that the newer cottages have been built cheaper than theirs, and that they, consequently, cannot without great hazard raise their rents, send an “influential deputation” to the promoters of the local bill to represent this alarming fact—of course, in order to deprecate the rate. Charitable gentlemen! It is obvious, however, that the new rate would still have a representative element in the rent, inasmuch as the addition to the rent of the newer and cheaper cottages would tend to prevent a reduction which must otherwise take place in the rent of the old. As to the addition to the rent being “more than an equivalent for the rate,” although Mr. Entwisle does not “see why” this should be, the owners of cottage property do, and there is no doubt at all of this being the fact.

In accordance with this statement, Mr. Entwisle says at a subsequent period of his examination, “In the case of all those persons who are in such a position as to render them liable to the rate at all, the education given under this bill *would not be free*, as they would be rated for it,” (1238). Mr. Richson also says, with great naïveté, respecting this boasted eleemosynary system of education, “I do not regard it in one sense as gratuitous to any who pay rates,” (644). The meaning of this is, that even the poorest will, after all, pay for their children’s schooling, through an increase of their rent. So much for charity! And it would seem that many of those for whom aid has been so urgently solicited, are likely to pay more in this circuitous manner than if they paid directly the school pence. Let the frugal people of Manchester reflect upon the following answer.

643. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Richson).*—Do you think that an occupier of £18* in Manchester is in such a condition as renders it necessary that his children should be provided with education out of the rate?

Ans.—I think that, with a rate, he would pay a larger proportion towards the general means of education than he does now. I find upon calculation that, on the assessments from £10 to £18, the total amount that would be paid in Manchester, Salford, and Pendlebury would be nearly £4,000 a year, and therefore paid by that class of persons alone to whom you are referring. I have no doubt they would do more than pay for their own class.

And so this patron of educational charity argues in respect of his twelve thousand and odd pets, who are recorded in his Table 29 as not sent to school in consequence of poverty: “If there were a school rate levied upon the principle of the poor-rate, and by which the father would be compelled in his cottage assessment, if he paid his share of the rate, to pay *quite as much* as the school fee, the fact of his paying it would induce him to send the child to school, (4874).

Yet, after all this, Mr. Richson gravely advocates a school rate as an eleemosynary process, and a relief to the poor! Good, simple hearted man! He does not see that whatever argument can be deduced from the poverty of the working classes in Manchester, it tells *against* a school rate; which, by his own admission, really, though indirectly, makes every poor man pay at least the full price for the article it is professed to *give* to him. If this were a bit of drollery, it would be not unworthy of Punch.

We may here dispose, in conclusion, of Mr. Richson’s elaborate method of testing the comparative value of free and paid education. He presents us with the opinions of 171 different schoolmasters, whom he took the pains to consult, and whose sentiments he arranges, as usual, in a tabular form, (Table 28). Now, to all this wisdom we do not feel ourselves called upon to pay any regard. Nor do we care to draw attention, either to Mr. Baines’s statement (1892) that the adoption of a system of gratuitous education “would be a retrograde movement, a return to a method tried for years, and abandoned as a failure,” or to the striking testimonies which he has adduced on the subject from the evidence taken before a Committee of the House in 1834 (1895).† Our answer to the whole matter is, that the education which Mr. Richson proposes to give is *not free*. He means to make the poor—aye, the poorest—pay for it, through the medium of the school-rate. The only difference is, that, instead of taking so much a week for the schooling of the children, he will add so much a week to the rent of the house. We forget ourselves, however, this is not the only difference: the twopence or fourpence per week for a child’s schooling has hitherto been, and, we suppose, will hereafter be, a voluntary payment; the addition to the rent, like the rate of which it would be the representative, would be exacted by law. Free education? Mr. Richson’s scheme proposes nothing less than to take poor men by the shoulders, and to say, ‘You *shall* pay for the schooling of your children, whether you can afford it, or not.’ It is plain, therefore, that, with whatever force he has proved the superiority of a gratuitous education, he has with equal force pronounced the condemnation of his own system.

Such is Mr. Richson’s scheme as a matter of charity!

* Erroneously printed “£16.”

† Mr. Fox slyly suggested that “the small payments in Prussia have now been abolished for some years,” and that “the plan is found to work very well.” Yes, Mr. Fox (as Mr. Baines hinted to you), at the point of the bayonet.

CHAPTER XIII.

SCHOOL SUPPORT.

Failing as a scheme of charity, the Local scheme may justly be said to fail altogether, and might be naturally expected to give us no further trouble; Mr. Richson, however, informs us that the Local plan, although primarily charitable, is not exclusively so. There are several other grounds on which he recommends it to our notice, and respecting these he shall again speak for himself.

The first consideration with me, he says, is, whether the people need an effort to be made in this direction at all. If they do not need it I think we should not proceed any further. Then I say, that next to the inability to pay the fees, is the question whether the fees that are now paid are sufficient to sustain the schools. . . . If they are not, and if the parents pay an amount which is insufficient, and they cannot afford to pay any more, it then becomes necessary that we should have recourse to some public fund to maintain the school in a more efficient state. And then arises the question, . . . that, if the schools are not sufficiently well conducted by the present system of school payments, and that, in order to support them better we want greater resources, we must have recourse, for a more equable distribution of education among the population, to renewed efforts on the voluntary system, or to a public fund, (358).

To these three points, it appears by the commencement of this answer, it was Mr. Richson's intention to add a fourth, although we do not find it distinctly stated, namely, that there is no material distinction between a rate for education and a rate for gas.

Now this statement of the secondary grounds upon which the Local bill is advocated, is clearly open to one general observation; namely, that they are not only secondary, but so very subordinate, that Mr. Richson himself does not think they form any proper basis for the measure, apart from its primary or charitable aspect. "If the people do not need it," says he, frankly and firmly, "I think we should not proceed any further." Now the people do not need it, nor is it anything answerable to their need if they did; consequently, Mr. Richson himself being judge, the matter ought not to be proceeded with any further. Now will you be quiet, gentlemen?

Let us look, however, for a moment, at the points brought forward by Mr. Richson.

There is a considerable degree of confusion in the statement of the second and third topics, on which, however, we are not disposed severely to animadvert; we merely rectify it by stating the matter thus:—"the state of the schools in the poorer districts is unsatisfactory, and the amount paid by the parents for the children who frequent them is insufficient now to sustain them in a proper and efficient manner," (353); so that, "in order to support them better we want greater resources," (358), and if we want greater resources, "we must have recourse to renewed efforts on the voluntary system, or to a public fund," (*ibid*). This is the entire substance of the two points stated by Mr. Richson, and they contain—nothing! We grant him the whole, and affirm that the whole yields not one atom of support to the measure he advocates. The schools require improvement—

true ; and greater resources—true ; and these must come either from the voluntary system or from a public fund—true again, and undisputed. Did Mr. Richson think he had any controversy with voluntary educationists on such points as these ? The whole question is, whether the voluntary system is, or is not, adequate to yield the resources required ? This Mr. Richson does not make one of his points, but he quietly says at the conclusion of his answer, “ *I think* the voluntary system is not adequate to support schools in the poorer districts in an efficient manner, or so as to make them really schools that will improve the people,” (358).

We should have been very glad if Mr. Richson had turned his attention more fully to this subject, which is, in truth, of primary importance to the whole argument, since an entire failure of the voluntary system has been loudly proclaimed by the Manchester philanthropists at large, and alleged as the grand basis of the new educational movement. The reverend gentleman, however, considers it his duty rather to assume than to prove this, the province allotted to him having been limited to inquiries relating to the actual condition of the school district. The subject itself—the power of the voluntary principle—was turned over to the Very Rev. the Dean of Manchester, whose statements in relation to it we shall now consider.

The Dean of Manchester “comes out strong” (to use a familiar phrase) on this part of the subject, and presents to us a piteous statement of the declining resources of the Manchester Church Educational Society, which, having been established in 1844, is now, after a career of only eight years, “in a state of decay,” (1284, *et seq.*) We have too much regard for the church people of Manchester, to bring out the humiliating details entered into by the Dean into any unnecessary publicity ; but we must take the liberty of saying, that they prove nothing but the shameful indifference of that class of the community to the cause of popular education. If we were to speak generally in any just terms of the wealth, energy, and public spirit of that body, we should use language which our readers might not unnaturally regard as extravagant ; yet we are told, that no Church Educational Society existed among them till 1844 ; that it owed its existence at that period to the zeal of one man, Dean Herbert ; that its revenues, then amounting to £4,389 16s. 11d., have been annually dwindling, and that the total collected in 1851 was £262 13s. 6d., leaving a debt of £420, “which the Committee will have to supply out of their own resources, if other gentlemen are not willing to assist them.” All this is to us unaccountable ; unless, indeed, it is to be ascribed to the large amount which the Manchester church people have derived from the grants of the Committee of Council, which has so accustomed them to lean upon public funds that they have become unapt to be liberal with their own. But to adduce this as any test of the power of the voluntary principle is absurd. To know that we should ask, what could the Manchester church people give *if they were disposed* ? To say that they are unable to support schools on the voluntary principle, is, as Mr. Baines well puts it (1699) “purely ridiculous.” Why, they have subscribed £8,000 to get this bill through Parliament, and will, no doubt, if it be wanted, subscribe £8,000 more. It is not, therefore, that they *cannot*, but that they *will not* ; and we have our doubts whether this kind of inability lays any fair ground for the benevolent interference of Parliament.

In his second examination Mr. Richson comes to the rescue of the Dean, and “points out to the Committee how little voluntary effort is

doing at this time in Manchester to support education in the daily School."

Of 52 schools, he says, classed in our return as Denominational day-schools, 10 are under government inspection, and receive government aid; these, of course, are not to be classed as schools supported by merely voluntary effort; 23 partake of the nature of private speculations, without any voluntary subscriptions whatever for their support, and in some cases the teacher has to pay a rent for the use of the school-room: there are two, the Odd Fellows' School, and the Unitarian school in New Bridge Street, Strangways, that I believe are not supported by voluntary aid, but of this I am uncertain; but of the remaining 17, which are supported more or less by voluntary liberality, one is the Miles Platting Mechanics' Institution school, another is the Jews' school, another the Juvenile Refuge; two are of a commercial character, with fees from 15s. to 20s. a quarter; one was sustained by Lady Potter herself, and two have applied for government aid: and therefore, all the independent effort of the voluntary system, as it is generally understood, is limited in the vast community of Manchester and Salford to the support of nine schools, (2393).

We do not care to enter into detail in the examination of this passage, but shall content ourselves with an observation which lies upon the surface. It is plainly dictated by an inclination to give the most contracted and niggardly view possible of voluntary educational efforts in Manchester and Salford, even to palpable unfairness. In illustration and vindication of our remark, it is enough to quote the very first item, in which 10 schools are cut off because, receiving government aid, they are not "supported by *merely* voluntary effort." Of course not; but this is no reason why the measure in which they are supported by voluntary effort should be ignored, more especially since it is well known to have been the policy of the Committee of Council to make all their grants fruitful in the cultivation of voluntary liberality.

We might meet the starved and uncandid description here given by Mr. Richson, by extracting statements made both by Mr. Baines and Mr. Adshead (1582, 1584, 2451, 2452), which are as forcible as they are true, and which, with all their force, do nothing more than exhibit fairly the other side of the picture; but we prefer making the rev. gentleman answer himself, by presenting the following summary of his own admissions, as given by Mr. Baines at the conclusion of his first day's examination, (1577).

I would now beg to be permitted to draw into one view the superabundant proof furnished by Mr. Richson's evidence of the power and sufficiency of the voluntary system. Mr. Richson has shown, first, that there is day school accommodation in Manchester, Salford, and the townships, in public schools (exclusive of superior boarding and day schools, and of all private schools), for 74,887 children, being 'considerably more than three times the whole number now attending' schools of that kind (Table 23, Ans. 118). Secondly, that of this vast amount of accommodation, in 172 schools, two thirds, or 110 schools, containing room for 43,146 children, have been built within the last 17 years (Table 23, and Ans. 202). Thirdly, that there is Sunday school accommodation for 67,627 children (Table 14). Fourthly, that of this amount, schools for 24,627 children have been built within 17 years (Table 14), being an increase in Manchester of 55 per cent., and in Salford of 59 per cent. (Ans. 22). Fifthly, that the number of day scholars is 34,354; of whom 29,077 are of the humbler classes; the latter number showing an average schooling for the whole of the children of those classes equal to four years and six weeks. Sixthly, that, in the poorest districts, the children attending school indicate an average schooling of four years and fourteen weeks for the whole. Seventhly, that the

number of Sunday scholars at a moderate estimate is 68,603 ; and the average attendance 51,452 ; the scholars having increased $59\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. since 1835, and the average attendance having increased $67\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Eighthly, that the proportion of Sunday scholars to the entire population is 1 to $5\frac{1}{3}$; their proportion to the inhabitants living in houses assessed below £18 a year, is 1 to $4\frac{9}{10}$; and that 68,603 Sunday scholars, among a population which gives 84,566 children between 3 and 15 years of age, shows an average attendance in the schools equal to $9\frac{3}{4}$ years. Ninthly, that the number of young persons and children attending evening schools or classes, in connexion with religious denominations, is 3,733 (actual attendance) ; the whole number, including private schools and public institutions, is probably from 6,000 to 7,000. Tenthly, that of 172 public schools, only 19 have received building grants from the Government, to the small aggregate amount of £8,283 : the rest having been built wholly by voluntary benevolence, and nearly the whole in connexion with religious bodies (Table A, Ans. 562). Eleventhly, that the day schools are so distributed through all the districts as to be "generally accessible," (Ans. 81) ; they are "so distributed among the various religious bodies, that abundant school room is already supplied for every possible shade of religious opinion." "There is school room accessible for almost everybody," (Ans. 107). Twelfthly, that "all the religious bodies have exerted themselves diligently, and with great success, in producing this increase of school accommodation" (Ans. 99). Thirteenthly, that there is "no difficulty in obtaining contributions to build schools when they are wanted," (Ans. 136). "There is no difficulty in Manchester and Salford in multiplying school buildings to any amount you may require," (Ans. 366). Fourteenthly, "that there is very little apparent opposition of schools," or "of waste of strength and funds," (Answers 210 and 211). Fifteenthly, that "in the poorer districts, there is no evidence whatever that the poor do not appreciate the education provided in the schools as much as others," (Ans. 93) ; that "there is a very great increase of desire for education," (Ans. 628). Sixteenthly, that "rivalry" among schools "stimulates school attendance and voluntary effort." That "rivalry among the Committees would produce a more healthy state of things, and a much better class of education would be given," (Ans. 636). Seventeenthly, that not merely has there been a vast increase of school accommodation within the last 17 years, but it may be presumed there has also been a corresponding improvement in the character and quality of the education ; this being evidenced by the discontinuance of some hundreds of the lowest class of private schools, and the reduction of the number of their scholars from 14,869 to 5,551, whilst the scholars in the public schools have at the same time increased from 5,384 to 19,516 (Table 21) ; this great change evincing an extraordinary power of educational improvement under the voluntary system. And eighteenthly and lastly, that all this extension and improvement of education has been realized without rates, without compulsion, and without municipal intervention, whilst the poor were paying for their children's schooling, and public benevolence and private enterprise had unrestricted scope.*

Certainly a power which, on Mr. Richson's own showing, has done so much, is worthy of some confidence as to that which it may hereafter do.

In confirmation of his opinion of the inadequacy of the voluntary system, Mr. Richson brings forward the following passage from the report of the Rev. W. Kennedy, one of the inspectors of schools, (2393).

"There are ten propositions on this subject, which my observation leads me to affirm. First, elementary schools in general are not at this time being adequately maintained ; secondly, there is not a fair prospect on the present system that they will have a sufficient annual income ; thirdly, on the contrary, there is in a majority of places a decline of income ; fourthly, the endea-

* Some discrepancies between the quotations here given and the evidence of Mr. Richson as it now appears, arise from the alterations made in the proof sheets, which were necessarily employed by Mr. Baines. They are not, however, material.

vours to obtain yearly contributions to schools are harassing and vexatious, and the means sometimes resorted to for raising funds, such as high fees and scales of fees, are injurious to the schools; fifthly, there is a painful and injurious uncertainty about the efficient maintenance of schools, also pernicious fluctuations of income, arising from such causes as the death of a benevolent landed proprietor, or of a liberal mill-owner, or the loss of a good master, undoing in a moment the work of years, and causing flourishing schools to fall into decay; sixthly, many districts are absolutely unable from poverty to maintain good schools without extraneous annual aid; seventhly, in districts where there is no absolute deficiency of money, or even where there is wealth, the schools are often suffered to languish from parsimony, or from indifference, or from hostility to education; eighthly, it is desirable to abate the jealousies and ill feeling often at present engendered among different religious denominations by contests for subscriptions to schools, &c., and to enable every deserving school to have an independent income; ninthly, it is often very desirable, but not feasible through want of means, to admit some of the scholars free to schools, and in some cases wholly free schools are requisite; tenthly, the above named evils cannot be remedied, nor the wants supplied, by any other means than by a rate for education."

A passage of a similar tendency from the same pen had been previously read by Mr. Entwisle, on the suggestion of one of the members of the Committee, Mr. Monsell, (1238).

Now Mr. Kennedy's opinion is certainly entitled to consideration, but it is far from being conclusive. As an inspector of schools he is but one of many, and some of his fellow labourers, with, of course, equal means of judging, hold an opinion directly contrary to his own. What, however, has he got to say?

The gist of Mr. Kennedy's statement is that subscriptions for the annual support of schools are not keeping pace with the demand for them; and he declares his opinion (1238) that "this want of adequate and constant funds for the annual maintenance of schools is at the bottom of nearly all the defects observable in schools:" *ergo*, says he, let us have a school rate. Now, whatever be the weight of his authority, on this matter we can confront him with one which he, at least, will confess to be equally high—namely, his own, as cited in the evidence before us.

1544. *Mr. W. Miles*.—Mr. Kennedy states this: "that *besides funds*, managers, and supervision, another thing is wanting to the complete success of evening schools, and of elementary schools also; I mean, the appreciation of education by the poor themselves."

1545.—Mr. Kennedy goes on to say, "And without some such stimulus, I almost fear that no measures, *not even a rate* providing good instruction for all, will have due effect. For even when we have got good school rooms, and good teachers, and plenty of them, how are we to get the scholars?"

What the particular nature of the "stimulus" contemplated by Mr. Kennedy may be is not stated in the evidence, and consequently we have nothing to do with it here—(it is, in fact, a system of compulsory attendance)—but it is clear from his own confession, that want of funds is neither the only nor the great difficulty in the school question, and that a rate alone would not lead to the grand development of popular education after which he pines. The problem that he puts is precisely that of Manchester itself. "When we have good school rooms, and good teachers, and plenty of them, *how are we to get the scholars?*" Mr. Richson's solution of this problem is a school rate; but this—let them take Mr. Kennedy's word for it—will not answer their purpose.

In relation to funds, indeed, no doubt an important element in the case, Mr. Kennedy thinks that, in the state of men's minds, "every thing points to a rate for education."

The higher classes at least, he assures us, are beginning to understand better the education question, and to take a warmer interest in it. Men's minds seem more prepared than I ever remember before, nay, even anxious, for some great development of the present meagre and tantalizing state of popular education. It is felt that very much effort is made for a small result. The clergy make great sacrifices of money and time; and what is more, enact the part of mendicant friars, (to use the expression of the vicar of a large parish in Lancashire) in order to keep schools alive, and the middle and higher classes are annoyed by constant demands upon their purse, in aid of schools about whose efficiency and permanency they entertain doubts. In short, school managers and other promoters of education begin to feel that theirs is a *strenua inertia*, much work and little result; they regard the present system as a stop-gap. All this has, I think, led to a temporary lull in the active promotion of the present machinery of education, while men's eyes are cast about to discover a system of maintaining schools which shall be at once efficient and sound, vigorous and permanent, (1238).

The sum of this is, if we understand it rightly, that people get somewhat tired of giving, and even of asking, annual subscriptions; but if this is any reason for putting schools upon the rates, it is equally a reason for putting hospitals, and a hundred other benevolent institutions there. We can assure Mr. Kennedy, that this state of things betokens no manner of affection for an additional rate. If people think that they already pay subscriptions enough, they are quite as deeply convinced that they pay rates enough; and although some might be not displeased that the expense of schools should be more equally divided, and the trouble of collecting the money be thrown upon other hands, they would soon begin to repine at the unexpected and intolerable sacrifices by which their ease had been purchased. If, however, the friends of public schools are enamoured of the tax gatherer and the church-rate, it will be easy for them to gratify this singular attachment without an act of parliament. Let them calculate what their rate at 6d. in the pound would be, and assess themselves at this amount; let them then invest the school collectors with the imaginary authority of a parish officer, and pay the sum without asking any questions. They might then, we think, be said to be fairly rated, and we believe the pecuniary difficulties of the schools would be heard of no more. We suspect, however, that a *bonâ fide* school rate would not be very popular in Manchester.

As to Mr. Kennedy's "ten propositions," the first nine of them (the last is a mere matter of opinion) are, no doubt, to a certain extent true; but they really are among the most harmless "propositions" in the world. They are a sample of the incidents invariably connected with all great social operations voluntarily sustained, or of the customary difficulties through and notwithstanding which they are conducted to a successful issue. We might in the same manner look over the nonconformist religious communities, for example, and after a similar distressing enumeration of their well known difficulties, infer the necessity for them of a national grant. It is in both cases perfectly true, that, with respect to funds, they will never be thoroughly at ease without access in some way to the public purse; but it is true also, that they are better without it, and that the difficulties to be contended with constitute the proper stimulus to the power applied to them, and *nothing more*. To take them all away, would

be but to cut the string by the resistance of which the kite maintains its position in the air. The passage quoted proves nothing to us, but that Mr. Kennedy does not understand either the elements of human nature, or the operations of human society. The ability of the people of Manchester, however, to pay adequate school subscriptions is clearly involved in their ability to pay a school rate. Nothing can be plainer than this, that if they can pay a school rate amounting to £30,000 a year, more or less, they can pay a subscription for educational purposes amounting to one half that sum—an amount which, *as subscribed*, would be more than sufficient for the purpose.

It will be said, perhaps, Yes; they can, but they will not. Who knows that they will not?" we ask. What adequate appeal has been made to them on this subject? Are there not fitter remedies for indifference or reluctance in such a matter than the imposition of a coercive payment, which, with a single specious advantage, entails a hundred mischiefs? We know something of the efforts which have been made to procure school contributions, and are quite aware of the fatigue undergone in some quarters, and of the exhaustion experienced in others; but we are confident—we cannot speak in more qualified terms—we are confident that nothing like the general, systematic, and influential appeal which is possible, and perhaps necessary, has yet been made. On this point we entirely agree with Mr. Baines, in the following portion of his evidence.

1698. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Baines).*—If private subscriptions cannot be obtained in support of these schools, and if the payments for the children cannot be had to keep them in a state of efficiency, what means would you adopt to render that education which you yourself think necessary more generally permanent throughout the whole community?

Ans.—I beg to express my conviction that private subscriptions can be obtained, and that payments from the parents can be obtained; and that every year of our progress proves that they can be obtained more and more. I would beg to submit to the Committee, that we are not, because at present education is not in a state of perfection, to hasten by any forcible or artificial means to bring about that state of perfection. I know nothing that is worth having that can be had on any other conditions than effort, perseverance, prudence, and skill; and it is so with education, as with everything else. And many institutions that are most valuable are those of slow growth, and not those which are instantly developed by a forcing system. The English constitution is an illustration of this.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.

Upon no point did the Committee seem more painfully to want information than upon the nature of the voluntary system, of which some of its members at least seemed to have very confused and imperfect conceptions. Hear, for example, the Chairman and Mr. Richson.

359. *Chairman (to Mr. Richson).*—What do you mean by the voluntary system?

Ans.—Voluntary subscriptions in support of particular schools.

360. You do not mean a supplying of schools by private schoolmasters,

trusting to the payments from those who use them ? You mean charity schools, supported by subscriptions ?

Ans.—I mean exactly what is understood by the voluntary system in support of schools ; but, if liberal-minded persons in Manchester think proper to subscribe a certain sum to a school, and they support it in that way, it may be called a charity school so far as it is supported by charitable contributions.

361. You mean that one portion of the community will voluntarily, at their own expense, supply the other portion of the community with free schools, if left to do so ?

Ans.—I beg your pardon ; I have not intimated any such opinion.

362. Your voluntary system seems to be a combined system, partly consisting of money from parliamentary grants or denominational grants, partly by subscriptions, and partly by school fees. When you use the term voluntary system, do you mean to apply it to the present system, or to some other ?

Ans.—To the present system ; which, indeed, so far as it is provided or stimulated by means of public grants, is not strictly speaking a voluntary system, although we know it is so called generally. I mean the system called the voluntary system, but which is really such only, perhaps, when persons from conscientious motives object to receive any parliamentary grant.

363. You would not call the National School Society system a voluntary system ?

Ans.—It is called so. The National Society is a voluntary society.

364. Is the system of assisting national schools by parliamentary grants consistent with what you call the voluntary principle ?

Ans.—I think not. I believe it is generally considered that this system is not strictly voluntary.

365. When you use the term voluntary system, you mean the system that now is in operation, the denominational schools being assisted partly by voluntary subscriptions, and partly by parliamentary grants ?

Ans.—Precisely. I use the term conventionally.

The Chairman was again at this subject with Mr. Baines.

1461. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—The voluntary system, I presume, means that the wealthy classes are to step forward and supply education to the poor ?

Ans.—Yes, that is the principle ; one part of the voluntary system.

Mr. Baines well saved himself by the latter part of his answer. For, in truth, the rendering of pecuniary aid is but one part of the voluntary educational system, and it is far from being the most prominent or the most important part of it. To spare our own words, however, we will take a definition of the voluntary system from a competent and a high authority, with which we are sure that Mr. Baines will concur. It is presented to our hand in a resolution passed at the meeting of the friends of voluntary education, held in Manchester in the autumn of 1851, and is as follows :—

Voluntary education *is*, and national education *ought to be*, the work of the people themselves, since the training of the child is essentially the duty of the parent—a responsibility which he cannot devolve on any classes, sects, or parties in the community ; that the true purposes of education would be defeated if, on the one hand, parents should be compelled to educate their offspring, or, on the other, should succeed in compelling their fellow-citizens to provide for them the means of instruction ; that all which enlightened patriotism and Christian benevolence can do in this matter, is to call the attention of parents to the duty of educating their children, to elevate, by all suitable means, the tone of popular thinking on this subject, to assist well-qualified persons in fitting themselves for the office of teachers, and to aid the really needy in their efforts to discharge a sacred obligation.”

Of the voluntary system of education generally, Mr. Baines gives his views in the following manner.

1727. *Mr. Bright.*—Will you state what you conceive to be the advantages of that voluntary system of education of which you have long been so distinguished an advocate?

Ans.—The advantages of the voluntary system of education appear to me to be briefly these. First, that it is already in existence, and in full and efficient operation, having been proved by the promoters of the bill to have supplied every part of the borough, every religious body, and every class of society, with superabundant means of education. [Answer continued in 1737.] Second, that it is perfectly just to all parties, civil and religious, and entirely free from objection on the ground of conscience. Third, that it leaves all in unrestricted freedom to promote education in whatever way they think right—in connexion with religion or otherwise, individually or by association, by public schools or by private enterprise; and that this unrestricted freedom and open competition afford far better securities for educational extension and improvement, than any possible system of municipal or parochial management. Fourth, that it admits of the unrestrained impartation of religious and moral instruction, the highest and best kind of education, whether considered in relation to the interests of the children themselves, or of society. Fifth, that by leaving [it] to religious bodies to aid in education, as at present, a moral influence is exercised on those bodies themselves, whilst they are brought extensively and most beneficially into contact with the poor, and the different classes of society are cemented together in the bonds of sympathy and gratitude. Sixth, that under the voluntary system there is better security for the religious character of the teachers than there could be under any other. Seventh, that the voluntary system is in accordance with the spirit and habits of self-reliance, which are alike favourable to private and public virtue, and the strongest safeguard of liberty. Eighth, that it presents no ground for party contention, sectarian jealousy, or municipal strife; but, by leaving all free and independent, secures at once the highest activity and public harmony.

Mr. Baines's appeal to facts is as strong as his appeal to principles.

1683. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).*—Do you draw any inference from the general advance of education in this country, in support of your opinion that the voluntary system is adequate to educate the people?

Ans.—Yes. I think there are facts before the country such as to justify very strong confidence in the continued progress of education, and that it will be abundantly sustained.

1684. With regard to Church schools, have you any facts to lay before the Committee?

Ans.—Yes. There is a blue book published, very much like the Parliamentary books, within the last two or three years, by the National Society, which shows that there is scarcely the smallest rural hamlet in which Church schools are not sustained. An inquiry was made by the National Society in 1847, and a comparison was made between the schools existing then and the schools existing ten years before, (in 1837), and the result showed, that out of 12,962 parishes or ecclesiastical districts in England and Wales, there were Church schools in 11,790, not reckoning schools of dissenters or private schools; and, of course, there are very many parishes too small, which are mere hamlets contiguous to other parishes, so that it seems to represent Church schools in nearly every parish of England and Wales.

1685. It would follow further, would it not, that in a great number of parishes there must be many more than one Church school; and in many more than one school not in connexion with the Church at all?

Ans.—Yes, it must.

1686. This is not an account of the number of Church schools, but of the number of parishes in which at least one Church school exists?

Ans.—Yes; but I will proceed to state, that the same inquiry showed an

astonishingly rapid increase in Church day schools within ten years. In 1837 there were 10,856 schools, and in 1847 there were 17,015 ; and the number of day scholars was 558,180 in the former year, and 955,865 in the latter, being an increase of 72 per cent. in the number of day scholars within ten years ; and this without either grant or rate, except some grants in aid of the building of schools, for the latter date, 1847, was the commencement of the Parliamentary grants in aid of the annual expenses.

1687. Then we may conclude that, even amongst that portion of the religious public which has been least disposed to rely upon voluntary effort, with regard to the spread of religion, voluntary efforts in educational matters have produced most remarkable results in the ten years ?

Ans.—Yes ; but I must say that there is scarcely anybody who do rely more upon the voluntary principle than the Established Church itself, and many splendid proofs of that are to be shown, both in behalf of religion, and in behalf of education.

1688. So far as your investigations have gone, would you not say that the reliance of the Church upon voluntary effort has greatly increased of late years !

Ans.—Immensely increased : within my own recollection voluntary effort was almost unknown to members of the Church of England ; it is now extremely great and splendid.

1689. Have you referred to the educational returns of 1818 and 1833, and have you drawn any conclusions from them which you wish to submit to the Committee ?

Ans.—The whole educational progress of the country, as exhibited by those returns to which allusion has been made, has been rapidly and constantly onward. The educational returns obtained by Lord Brougham's Committee, in 1818, showed only 674,883 day scholars, and 477,225 Sunday scholars, in England and Wales. The returns obtained by Lord Kerry's Committee, in 1833, showed 1,276,947 day scholars, and 1,548,890 Sunday scholars ; and it seems highly probable that the census of 1851 will show more than 2,000,000 day scholars, and as many Sunday scholars. Probably the returns obtained in 1818 were very defective, though Lord Brougham and Mr. Rickman, and most subsequent writers, relied upon them ; but still the increase of education must have been exceedingly great, and such as to give every reasonable confidence that it will, ere long, without either aid or compulsion on the part of the legislature, be satisfactory, both in quantity and quality.

1691. Do you know anything of the great educational societies in England, and whether they have been increasing in number of late years ? I ask you these questions that you may lay before the Committee the grounds, with regard to Manchester, of your belief that voluntary combination is doing great things, and, as you think, sufficient for educational purposes.

Ans.—I have myself witnessed the rise of most of the great educational societies of England and Wales within the last forty years ; and I wish to submit an observation, which, I think, will be found to apply to Manchester, that of all these great educational societies which have been formed during the present century, not one has been discontinued, or has materially, if at all, relaxed in its exertions. I will mention a number of societies, perhaps all of which operate in Manchester and Salford : the British and Foreign School Society, the National Society, the Home and Colonial Infant School Society, the Diocesan School Societies, the Wesleyan School Committee, the Congregational Board of Education, the Voluntary School Association, the Catholic Poor School Committee ; ragged schools, schools for the deaf and dumb, for the blind, and even for idiots ; orphan asylums, schools for the sons of the clergy, of ministers and missionaries ; mechanics' institutions ; not to mention universities, colleges, and training institutions of various kinds, for the upper and middle classes.

1582. Can you furnish the Committee with any information with regard to the educational institutions of Manchester ?

Ans.—These educational institutions are numerous, and of almost every description. They include a richly endowed grammar school ; Hulme's charity

for exhibitioners to Oxford University, worth more than £5,000 a year, and likely to become worth twice or three times that sum; the Blue-coat Hospital and Library, founded by Humphrey Chetham; the exhibitions of the Duchess of Somerset and the Rev. John Smith; a modern university, for which Mr. John Owens bequeathed about £100,000; the Lancashire Independent College, built at a cost of £25,000, for training Independent ministers; the Didsbury College, for training Wesleyan ministers; the new college for training Unitarian ministers; National and Lancasterian Schools; Diocesan and other Church Societies for aiding the education of the poor; the numerous Day schools and Sunday schools erected by all denominations of Christians, recorded in Mr. Richson's tables; Literary and Philosophical Societies, Museums, and Galleries; Mechanics' Institutions, Athenæums, and Lyceums; Infant Schools, Evening Schools, Ragged Schools, Factory Schools; besides those noble societies auxiliary to education and religion, the Bible Society, Religious Tract Societies, City Mission, Scripture Readers, &c.

1703. Will you give the Committee any facts, or will you state your views as to the vast increase in education, especially of the working classes, since 1818?

Ans.—I request to be allowed to offer some remarks, to show that the increase in education since 1818 must have been chiefly in the working classes. If we assume the returns of 1818 and 1833 to have been correct, and also that the number of day scholars in 1846 was 2,000,000, as calculated by Professor Hoppus (Mr. Charles Knight calculated them at 2,200,000), and if we compare these numbers of day scholars with the population at the respective periods, the proportions would be these: in 1818 one day scholar to 17 inhabitants; in 1833 one day scholar to $11\frac{1}{3}$ inhabitants; in 1846, one day scholar to $8\frac{1}{3}$ inhabitants. But the most interesting view to take of this immense improvement, is to consider how very large a part of it must have been realized by the working classes. The children of the upper and middle classes were in all probability kept at school nearly as long in 1818 as in 1846. If we assume that the children of these classes were one fourth of the whole, and that they remained at school on the average seven years in the former period, and eight years in the latter, we shall find what proportion of the children of the working classes must then have been at school, and what would be the average length of their schooling. The whole number of children between five and fifteen years of age, in England and Wales, in 1818, was 2,758,356. They then formed $24\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the population. One fourth of that number for the upper and middle classes would be 689,589; and if these were at school on the average seven years, we should find 482,712 scholars of those classes at one time. The whole number of day scholars then was 674,883, leaving therefore only 192,171 for the working classes. But the children of the working classes being three-fourths of the whole, would number 2,068,767; and if only 192,171 were at school, it would show only one child in every $10\frac{3}{4}$ children of the working class in school at one time in 1818; and the average length of schooling for the whole would only be $10\frac{3}{8}$ months. In 1846 the whole number of children between 5 and 15 years of age was 3,891,127; they then formed $22\cdot854$ per cent. of the population. One fourth of that number for the upper and middle classes would be 972,782; and if these were at school on the average eight years, we should find 778,226 scholars belonging to those classes of society at one time. The whole number of day scholars being then 2,000,000, there would be left 1,221,774 for the working classes. The children of the working classes being three-fourths of the whole, would number 2,918,345; and if 1,221,774 were at school, it would show one child in every $2\frac{1}{3}$ children of the working class in school at one time in 1846; and the average length of schooling for the whole would be four years and nine weeks; thus the proportion of the children of the working classes at school would appear to have increased from one in $10\frac{3}{4}$ in 1818 to one in $2\frac{1}{3}$ in 1846, and the average length of schooling for the whole to have increased from $10\frac{3}{8}$ months in 1818, to four years and nine weeks in 1846.

1707. You yourself think that it would be fair, in order to arrive at a just conclusion, to make some addition probably to the numbers reported by

the Committee of 1818; but making that addition, it would still leave an enormous improvement, though somewhat less than that which your figures show?

Ans.—It would. I should think it not unfair to assume that those returns were very defective, although, as I have said, they have always been relied upon by Lord Brougham, and by Mr. Rickman, the very able statist who compiled the population returns, and the education census in 1831 and 1833; but I am disposed to think that we might fairly add 20 per cent. to the number of the day scholars given by the returns of 1818, bringing them up from 674,883 to 809,859. The result would then be this, that, of the children of the working classes, only one in every $6\frac{1}{2}$ would be at school at the same time in 1818, and the average length of schooling for the whole would be one year and seven months. On this supposition, the proportion of day scholars to the population would be as 1 to 14 in 1818, and 1 to $8\frac{1}{2}$ in 1846.

The important advantages to the upper classes derived incidentally from the voluntary system were thus touched upon.

1657. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).*—Is it your opinion that in the system that now exists, where the education afforded is partly the result of the exertions of the working classes, and partly the result of the co-operation of the richer classes, advantages to the middle and upper classes result, and that that is one reason why you would be unwilling to alter the present system?

Ans.—Yes. I conceive there are advantages to the upper and middle classes attendant on voluntary efforts for education, which it would be almost impossible to over-estimate. In Manchester there are from 8,000 to 9,000 persons of both sexes, for the most part in the flower of life, engaged as gratuitous teachers in Sunday schools. But this does not indicate the whole number actively engaged in behalf of education, especially in the congregations which support day schools. Two illustrations may be given. First, in Cavendish Square Chapel (Rev. Dr. Halley's), there are 98 officers and teachers of the Sunday school, and 26 members of the Sunday school committee, 30 members of the day school committee, who visit the schools two each week; 16 members of the ladies' committees; 23 ladies engaged in clothing or other societies for the schools; making a total of 193; or, deducting for persons filling more than one office, 150 individuals. The Sunday schools are supported by annual collections, to which all contribute, and the day schools are self-supporting. The teachers of the Sunday school visit the children at their own houses. Second, In Rusholme Road Chapel (Rev. James Griffin's) there are 108 officers and teachers of the Sunday school; 46 members of the Sunday and day school committees; eight visitors of the schools; 20 members of the ladies' committee; 15 ladies engaged in clothing or other societies for the schools; 4 visitors at the children houses; and fifty annual subscribers to the day schools; making a total of 251; or, deducting for persons in more than one capacity, 212 individuals. The Sunday schools are supported by annual collections. Thus the work of benevolence is made to pervade a great part, indeed almost the whole of a congregation, either in the form of pecuniary contribution or of active service. Nearly all are interested in the work of education. And this is a moral and religious advantage of a very high kind, especially to the young persons of both sexes engaged as teachers; whilst it is a means of extending the influence of the upper classes among the families of the lower that must be highly beneficial to the latter, and must cement together the various classes of society. In the first of these congregations there are 256 day scholars and 1,221 Sunday scholars; and in the second there are 150 day scholars, and 994 Sunday scholars. To whatever extent the work of education might be taken out of the hands of religious bodies, and placed under municipal or parochial management, the members of those religious bodies would suffer an injury.

Mr. Baines thus stated his reasons for confiding in the permanent sufficiency of the voluntary system.

1665. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).*—Do you think there is any reason to fear that voluntary support to schools will fail?

Ans.—I think there is no reasonable ground whatever to fear that voluntary support to schools will fail.

1666. Will you give the Committee, as briefly as you can, the grounds on which you believe that the voluntary system may be relied upon to support schools, as it has evidently been sufficient to build them?

Ans.—It seems to me to rest on laws of our moral nature as certain, and as little liable to fail, as the laws of physical nature. Permanence cannot be predicated* of any particular school; it is not desirable that bad schools should be perpetuated, and feeble schools may sink, as many feeble children die young. But, generally speaking, we may feel as certain that schools may be sustained, as that children will continue to come to them for education. We may rely as confidently on the support of the schools, as on the support of the churches, the medical charities, and the literary societies of Manchester; as confidently as the booksellers rely on the sale of the 80,000 publications which they order for the weekly supply of Manchester; nearly as confidently as all the industry of the district proceeds in reliance on the accustomed demand. Both the Sunday schools and day schools have been continually on the increase for more than half a century.

Somewhat startled, as it would seem, by the confidence with which Mr. Baines rested on the analogy between the gainful and the benevolent impulses, Mr. Gibson put to him the following question.

1668. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—You think it as certain that the wealthier classes will continue voluntarily to assist the poorer classes in giving them education, as that a profitable trade should keep on increasing under the ordinary rules of trade?

Ans.—The two things are undoubtedly very different. At the same time I will express my belief, and I think I can adduce abundant proofs to sustain it, that the one is as much to be relied upon as the other.

Being further examined as to the grounds on which he thought reliance might be placed that there would in future, on the voluntary principle, be adequate provision for the education of children of all classes, Mr. Baines gave the following admirable answer.

It seems to me that, under the voluntary system, there are the following strong grounds for reliance that the children will receive education. We may rely first, on the parents, their natural affection for their offspring, their sense of duty, the interest they have in their children being well trained, and dutiful, orderly, and virtuous; the actual convenience to mothers of having their children at school; the growing sense, even among the poor, of the value of education; and the influence of general opinion upon them, making them feel it a disgrace that their children should be uneducated. Secondly, on Christian benevolence, all sections of Christians having come to a sense of the importance of education, and especially of moral and religious training. . . . Thirdly, on enlightened patriotism and philanthropy; there are many ardent friends of education who are not so on religious grounds. Fourthly, on the self-interest and active competition of considerable classes, directly or indirectly engaged in the advancement of education; private schoolmasters, authors of elementary works, and all who are engaged in providing the apparatus of tuition, editors of cheap magazines, books, and newspapers. Fifthly, on the law of intellectual progress established by history, and never in more active operation than during the present century. Thus our reliance is on the laws of nature, the spirit of religion, and the principles of freedom, (1579).

We could have wished that some member of the Committee had

* Erroneously printed "*predicted.*"

directed the attention of Mr. Baines to the practical difficulties which have been found in the working of the voluntary principle in its application to popular education. The existence of such difficulties is but too notorious, and they constitute the chief, and so far as we know, the only argument of weight against the continued application of the principle itself. They seem to us to indicate some kind and amount of mistake in the actual measures which have been adopted, and to open before enlightened philanthropists a most important avenue of inquiry and investigation. No principle is more fully established than this, that nature is as economical as she is bountiful, as surely leaving nothing to waste as nothing to want; and if, as in such a case is very probable, in the high excitement of benevolent feeling, there has been too lavish an expenditure of resources of one kind, and too great an oversight of resources of another kind, the embarrassment which has resulted may be regarded as at once the just punishment, and the proper correction, of our indiscretion. In this case, it is not for us petulantly to fling away the noble principle we have been acting upon, but carefully to re-examine our methods of applying it, and to make our doings harmonize with a just philosophy. In such an inquiry we have no doubt Mr. Baines could have rendered us valuable assistance; but this topic was not started.

On the whole, we have no hesitation in affirming the broad principle thus laid down by Mr. Baines.

1459. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—Are the Committee to understand you to be in favour of interference from some quarter or other to provide education for the people, rather than leaving education to be supplied by the laws of supply and demand which apply to other matters?

Ans.—I am not in favour of any government or legal compulsion or authority.

1460. You would not be prepared to leave education to shift for itself?

Ans.—Yes: believing that education, like industry, will be much better off when it shifts for itself.

1669. *Chairman.*—But you would not trust education entirely to take care of itself? You would advocate, as I understand, that there should be a supply of education given by the wealthy classes to the poorer classes?

Ans.—That they should aid and assist.

1670. If the supply is given by one set of persons to another set of persons, and if it can only be relied upon in that form, would it not be better that that supply should be given with certainty, than be left to be given by the voluntary will of those persons?

Ans. I think not. I think it would be much better, and I believe it would be more abundantly given, and that the contributors would be actuated by many higher influences, if given voluntarily, than if given by any compulsory means.

The sentiments of Mr. Adshead were in general concurrence with those of Mr. Baines. We give a few extracts from his evidence.

2454. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—Your opinion appears to be that education is making satisfactory progress, and that unaided voluntary effort will, in some short time, secure all that can be reasonably desired for the working classes?

Ans.—I consider with regard to education, that it is well to let well alone. I think, if the voluntary effort is allowed to go on unfettered in its own proper course, it is accomplishing, and in course of time it will accomplish, that which, I think, those who feel an interest in the education of the people would desire.

2529. *Mr. W. Miles.*—You stated as far as regarded education in Manchester

and its vicinity, you would 'leave well alone;' but can you apply that term to the education at present afforded in Manchester?

Ans.—I referred to a sentiment which had been expressed when it was heard what we had done, and what we were doing.* When I say let well alone, I do not mean that we should stand still and do no more; I think we should still go on, and do all we can.

2517. *Mr. Peto.*—Is it not your opinion, that, where the parent has the ability, it is a sacred and incumbent duty upon him to educate his own child?

Ans.—Distinctly.

2518. Where that ability does not exist in Manchester, in your judgment, has not the voluntary system, to the utmost extent that could be expected, filled the void?

Ans.—It has very largely done so.

2519. And if allowed to go on, in time, it certainly would meet all the requirements of the case, would it not?

Ans.—I believe it would.

2098. *Chairman.*—You think, do you not, that in many cases the voluntary system is scarcely necessary, and that the schools would be entirely self-supported?

Ans.—I think so in many instances.

2099. But, if it were necessary to do anything, you would prefer that it should be done by voluntary contributions? If any extraneous means should be resorted to beyond the fees paid by the pupils, you would prefer that those contributions should come from volunteers, and not be levied equally upon the public?

Ans.—Most decidedly.

We may be allowed, in concluding this part of the subject, to notice the marked and singular change in the aspect of the educational question as a money question, since the period when the attention of political philanthropists was first drawn to it.

1692. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).* The friends of the scheme which has been discussed a great deal in this Committee, seem to dwell upon the necessity of providing means, not to build, but to continue schools: is not their fear, with regard to the want of means to continue the schools, very different from the impression that prevailed among the Members of the Committee of this House that sat upon this question on a former occasion?

Ans.—It is. The first Committee of the House of Commons which sat on this subject, namely, that of Mr. (Lord) Brougham, in 1818, expressed an opinion just the opposite of that held by the promoters of this Bill. In their Report they said, "Whenever the efforts of individuals can support the requisite number of schools, it would be unnecessary and injurious to interpose any Parliamentary assistance; but your Committee have already clearly ascertained, that in many places private subscriptions could be raised to meet the yearly expenses of a school, while the original cost of the undertaking, occasioned chiefly by the erection and purchase of the school house, prevents it from being attempted. Your Committee conceive, that a sum of money might be well employed in supplying this first want, leaving the charity of individuals to furnish the annual provision requisite for continuing the school, and possibly for repaying the advance." The present prevailing opinion is, that there is no difficulty in obtaining donations to build the school, but that the difficulty is in afterwards supporting it. The history of the growth of education from 1818 to the present time, however, in Manchester and elsewhere, fully proves that the people themselves can both build the schools and support them.

* It was remarked by an influential member of parliament, when the deputation from Manchester waited upon him, "A great deal has been done upon the voluntary principle, and a great deal is doing; and it is a question with me whether one had not better let well alone," (2500).

CHAPTER XV.

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM, CONTINUED.

Having in the preceding chapter presented the evidence which pertains to the system of voluntary educational effort in its broader aspects, we shall in this group together some minor topics which have a more or less intimate relation to it.

The following general reasonings apply to the voluntary system as compared with a school rate.

1744. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—Do you not think, if it be the duty of the wealthier classes to supply schooling for the poorer classes, it would be better that the burden of this supply should be distributed equally over those wealthy classes, than to be left to a few, who are generously disposed, to bear the whole burden?

Ans.—I think it would be more equitable, if you could do it without destroying the very character of benevolence; but if you are to assess all equally and compulsorily, benevolence is gone, liberality is at an end, and the whole becomes a matter of compulsion.

1745. *Mr. Fox.*—Then you think it better that the poor should have their children educated by benevolence, that is to say, by charity, than of right, at schools established by public authority?

Ans.—I think it better that they should be educated with the assistance only of the benevolence of religious persons, and such others as may be disposed to lend assistance, than that they should be educated under a system which is just a system of poor rates, and a system of compulsory taxation; which seems to me much more likely to pauperize a community, than the bestowment of that benevolence which is both free, and especially sanctified by being religious in its character, and the least humiliating and the least degrading form in which benevolence can be bestowed.

1746. Supposing that a number of persons combine together, and agree to contribute by rates a certain amount of expense for supporting, for instance, gas, or paving, or lighting, or anything else, in which they have a common interest, does any man feel pauperized by having paid a rate to support that which he wants, and afterwards enjoys?

Ans.—No: not in the case of gas, where the benefit is universal, and just in proportion to the payment made.

The advocates of free trade came down rather heavily on the system of aiding in the support of schools by subscription, in the following manner.

2093. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—Have you turned your attention to the effect of this system of subscribing to the support of schools? Take the case of an independent private schoolmaster; what effect has it upon his condition?

Ans.—I believe it must in a great degree render him dependent.

2092. Could a common private day-school live?

Ans.—I think not.

2095. Supposing you were to subscribe to enable [some] shoemakers to sell their shoes at a lower price than the rest of the trade, what effect would that have upon the independent shoemakers?

Ans.—It is what I should not do.

2096. You think that what is necessary in the case of education would not be right in other trades and occupations?

Ans.—I think the two cases are not analagous.

2475. Is not your voluntary system a complete interference with what may be called free trade in education? Can private schoolmasters compete with those schools?

Ans.—I do not consider that it is carried to an extent to interfere with the private schoolmaster.

2476. *Mr. Bright.*—Is it not quite clear, that, with regard to education, so far as the means now used to provide for it go, it has not been provided upon the same principle that shoemakers' and tailors' shops are provided?

Ans.—That comparison has been attempted before, and I really cannot see the analogy.

2477. At present you provide education partly by the payments of those who purchase it at the school, and partly by contributions of such persons who do not partake directly in the advantages of the school for their own children?

Ans.—Yes, to some degree.

2478. Then supposing you and I, and other people in Manchester, would no more subscribe to a school than we should think of subscribing to a shoemaker's shop in a particular village, what would become of education then?

Ans.—I should feel a great deal more concerned in subscribing for a school than in subscribing to a shoemaker's shop; for I should consider that I was fulfilling a duty to improve society by advancing education.

What Mr. Adshead was reluctant to admit was freely acknowledged by Mr. Baines.

1551. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—If you partly support a school by charitable contributions, and partly by school fees, do not you cause a depreciation to take place in the fees that can be asked at a private school?

Ans.—You do to some extent. The effect has been, that hundreds of private schoolmasters have been actually driven out of Manchester alone by the introduction of public schools.

This onslaught on the voluntary system was made by the advocates of free trade in the Committee, we suppose, because they expected that the friends of voluntary education, they being also, for the most part, free traders, would be somewhat tenderly sensitive to the force of such an argument. We thank them for their faith in our consistency, but we think they have failed in their aim. Before any argument from the admitted propriety of *free* trade can come into bearing, we must have it established that the case to which it is to be applied is a case of *trade* itself. Now we do not know that, with respect to education, this can be laid down. There are some human wants at once so urgent and so imperfectly supplied by the agency of traffic, that, by general consent, benevolent aid is afforded in the attainment of them. Of these, wants which relate to health form a ready and prominent example, and with them those which relate to mental and moral culture may naturally and properly be associated. People subscribe to support dispensaries and hospitals as well as schools, and it may as well be made a matter of complaint that medical treatment may thus be had at less than its cost, as that education can be so. If the latter bears hard upon the private schoolmaster, the former bears no less hard on the private practitioner.

If, however, it really afforded an objection to the voluntary system in the minds of any of the Committee, that school subscriptions interfere with the occupation of the private schoolmaster, we may be allowed to remind them that a school rate would perpetrate the same mischief to a much larger extent. It is merely blowing hot and cold with the same breath, upon this ground to complain of subscriptions, and to advocate a tax.

An objection of a different kind was adduced against the subscription system in the following manner.

1552. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—But these authorities say that the people

appreciate what they pay for, and that as a thing becomes cheap it becomes in their estimation less worth seeking. If you depress private schools, and cheapen [education] by this competition which is introduced through charity, do you not indirectly cause the non-attendance which is complained of?

Ans.—I do not see that you cause the non-attendance.

This ingenious objection, which is quite after the manner of Mr. Gibson, is founded upon a misunderstanding, and consequent misapplication of the principle alleged. There is a clear *non sequitur*, indeed, in his statement. From the fact alleged, that “people appreciate what they pay for,” it does not follow that “as a thing becomes cheap” they seek it less eagerly; the only fair deduction is, that they would think it less worth having if it were given them. We should think the Manchester men know very well that the cheapness of cottons increases their use, while giving cottons away would consign them to the dunghill. The conductors of public schools have made this discovery, and have acted upon it.

Among the objections to education on the voluntary system, this appeared to find a place in the minds of some of the Committee, that it might be too sectarian to be acceptable.

1652. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—With regard to the competition for scholars, do you imagine that there is any jealousy in the minds of any considerable number of the labouring classes, that any attempt will be made to enlist them, as it were, under some particular religious denomination, and which creates a reluctance on the part of the parents to send their children to school?

Ans.—I have never heard any facts to lead me to believe that there was such a feeling. I have heard it said by speakers at public meetings that such did exist; but I have never myself heard any facts that would justify it, and I do not believe it. I firmly disbelieve that there is any disinclination on the part of the working classes generally to send their children to schools, in consequence of those schools being connected with religious bodies.

1653.—If I understand you correctly, you consider one of the principal motives which actuate those who are supporting the voluntary system, to be the spread of religious instruction among the working population; their object is to spread their religious views, is it not?

Ans.—The two things are different; one is to spread religious instruction, and the other is to spread their religious views. I should answer the first in the affirmative; and with regard to the second, I have not the least hesitation in saying, that there is a certain amount of jealousy, (shall we call it?) or rivalry and zeal, to spread, as the Right Honourable Chairman has put it, their own religious views, but that the great staple of their motive is a desire to promote the religious instruction and the welfare of the children. I have not the shadow of a doubt upon it.

1654.—Then the effect of that is, in that competition to spread the religious views of the respective denominations among the people, that the people get in addition secular instruction from those different religious bodies?

Ans.—It is so.

1655.—Then you attribute, in fact, the beneficial result of their receiving secular instruction to religious zeal among those different religious bodies?

Ans.—To a very great extent, it is undoubtedly to be attributed to that; so that religion is, I was going to say, infinitely the most powerful auxiliary to education in this country.

1656. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—Is it not fair to state that the wealthy members of the different religious communities desire to give a sound religious education to the children of their poorer brethren?

Ans.—There cannot be the shadow of a doubt about it.

2464. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—Upon the plan of denominational schools, you make it an absolute necessity that children of different religious denomi-

nations shall always be kept separate, and be trained up separately from their earliest youth. Do not you think that that tends to perpetuate sectarian distinctions?

Ans.—I think not.

How catholic the gentlemen of the House of Commons are, and averse, forsooth, to “sectarian distinctions!” Ah! It is not denominational schools which keep up “sectarian distinctions,” but a politically privileged and richly endowed church establishment; and if members of Parliament really wish to get rid of these unamiable things, let them put an end to the monster mischief which creates them.

Hear another objection.

2513. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—Your voluntary principle involves charity. You give the people education at less than it costs, and the rating principle is merely a mode of supplying schools so that every man pays his quota towards their support. . . . Therefore the rating principle is a more independent one than your voluntary principle?

2495.—Would not every person in the kingdom that lives under a roof contribute, according to law, to the rate; and therefore might not every person consider that the education he obtained in the school was a return for the rate he paid? And would there in that case be any charity in it?

These questions are suicidal. Why, Mr. Richson and Mr. Entwisle have assured us solemnly that their whole system is a charity, and it is in their very teeth that the Chairman of the Committee asserts the contrary, and commends it on this ground! Even on his own showing, however, the rate system is liable to precisely the same charge as the voluntary system; for it clearly “gives education at less than it costs,” since it taxes the whole community to pay for the education of a part. The difference in the two cases is, that in the one the money is paid voluntarily, and in the other it is exacted by law; a difference which certainly supplies no argument of weight in favour of the rate system.

But the voluntary system, say these profound social economists, is a great hardship on the subscribers. Hear Mr. Gibson.

2500. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—Is it not rather a hard thing upon those who are so religiously and benevolently disposed, that society should expect them to bear the whole burden, and that persons who are enjoying great advantages in this country should not contribute in any degree to support this important matter of education?

Ans.—It is not a hard thing for those who contribute upon the voluntary principle; and if they do not think so, I think we have nothing to do with those who will not give.

2502. Though the country is greatly indebted to those voluntaries for what they have done, still do you not think they have had more than their share of the burden, and that it is time for the country to consider whether it ought not to be more equally distributed?

Ans.—It is time enough to distribute the burden when the voluntaries complain.

The voluntaries are certainly very much obliged to Mr. Gibson, and to “Society,” whose voice he assumes to utter, for the kind appreciation of their services, and more especially for their pity under the disproportionate burden which they bear: but we beg to suggest, that if Society is really so very sorry for the voluntaries, there is a much easier, and quicker, as well as a more agreeable way of relieving them than the im-

sition of a school-rate ; it is by a general and liberal subscription. In all respects this is much to be preferred to a rate, and not least in this, that it will not require the passing of an act of parliament, or necessitate tedious examinations before Committees of the House of Commons. We shall certainly expect, after this, to see enlarged lists of subscribers to the schools in Salford and Manchester.

Finally, the fluctuating character of the support of voluntary schools was adduced as an objection to them.

1702. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Baines).*—Do you think that such a state of things as you have just described—namely, a great flowing in of contributions at one time, and the existence of debt at another, is favourable to the steady conducting of such a work as the education of the people ?

Ans.—I do think that the education of the people will have more life and power, take that whole system together, than it would have, if you adopted any compulsory mode of raising the funds.

Fluctuation in school-funds is, no doubt, an evil *per se*, but it is an evil which may be got rid of at too high a price. Mr. Fox's question might be asked respecting all the benevolent institutions in the land.

CHAPTER XVI.

A SCHOOL RATE COMPARED WITH COMMON RATES.

It is now time that we should pay some attention to Mr. Richson's further point, or rather his second subordinate reason for advocating a school-rate, namely, that there is no material difference between it and other rates. That we may do him no injustice in this respect we will cite that part of the evidence in which this topic is introduced.

358. *Chairman (to Mr. Richson).*—What distinction do you draw between a common school-rate, and a common gas rate, or a common paving rate ? You do not establish a gas rate upon the consideration that people cannot afford to pay for gas, but it is a convenient mode of providing gas equally amongst the population ?

Ans.—I was going to mention that as another point.

What the Rev. Gentleman was going to say upon this point, however, does not appear, since the subject, we believe, does not come up again throughout his examination—forgotten perhaps (and we can readily excuse him) in the multiplicity of points to which his attention was directed ; but, in default of further elucidation, we may find something here not unworthy of remark, and the more so because this comparison of a school-rate to a gas rate, if it was not dwelt upon in the Committee, has been strongly insisted on out of it.

In the first place, then, it is clear that this argument for a school-rate is absolutely fatal to its character as a charity. The Chairman of the Committee said very justly, and Mr. Richson seems to have tacitly assented to it, that we “do not establish a gas rate upon a consideration that people cannot afford to pay for gas,” and if a school-rate really resembles a gas rate (as some of its advocates so loudly assert), it ought not to be based on the consideration that people cannot afford to pay for schooling.

If Mr. Richson once allows this comparison, his charity scheme is put *hors de combat* for ever.

A school rate, if it be like a gas rate, must be, as the Chairman again very properly tells us, "a convenient mode of providing" education "equally amongst the population." Very well, if there be a common need which the people can agree thus to supply, and a common article by which they can be satisfied to supply it. This is far from being the case, however. A great many people in Manchester have education for their children already, and would not have the education to be provided by the rate, even if they had not; the two cases differ widely, therefore, and the idea of a rate is not applicable. We thank the Chairman of the Committee for this clear and satisfactory exposition of the matter, with which exposition it would seem, however mysteriously, that Mr. Richson concurs.

Even the Chairman himself, however, with all his clear-sightedness, has evidently a hankering after a rate, the principle of which he would not allow to be at all the "lifeless" affair which Mr. Adshead (2509) charged it to be.

You do not find, said he, as a matter of fact, that the supply of water and sanitary matters, such as gas, paving, and lighting, which are supported by the ratepayers for their common benefit, and paid for by all, at all declines in consequence of the mode of supporting it, (2510).

Just so, Mr. Chairman, because in these cases there is an adequacy in routine labour to supply the want; but in a matter so infinitely important as education—or, which is the same thing, religion—routine work will not do. We may get an establishment of schools and schoolmasters, as we have already of churches and clergymen; but we want EDUCATION, and consequently a system of voluntary exertion.

Even the poor rate has been brought into this argument.

2466. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead).*—Supposing you were to relieve the poor upon a system of voluntary contributions, do you think that the contributions of the charitable would be a good substitute for an equable rate?

No one knows better than Mr. Gibson, we should think, that the poor rate is the worst possible mode of relieving the poor, and that its evils are at this moment (although by the strenuous exertions of successive parliaments much reduced) multiform and unmanageable. A poor rate is, however, in the present state of society a necessary evil; a school rate would be an evil of similar character, although it may be hoped not of equal magnitude, but it will be found, we rejoice to believe, *unnecessary*.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE COST OF PAUPERISM AND CRIME.

We have now, we believe, dealt with all the grounds, both primary and secondary, on which Mr. Richson, in the early part of his examination, announced his intention to rest the claims of the local scheme; we find, however, one other, which, although introduced without announcement, we

must not pass over. It is the public and private saving to be effected by an extended system of popular education, as a means of diminishing the expense occasioned by pauperism and crime.

417. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—One of your arguments in favour of the principle of rating is, that there is a great deal of crime and poverty in Manchester, some considerable portion of which you think might be avoided if the people were better educated?

Ans.—Yes.

The argument fully stated is as follows:—

416. I was just now pointing out to the Committee that the Borough rate, when collected, is applied towards the expenses arising from a certain amount of pauperism and a certain amount of crime; and that education appears to be the only means known, short of absolute coercion, of effectually suppressing pauperism or preventing crime. I say that money is expended for those particular purposes, and, as a mere question of economy, I think it is necessary to educate the people to save this expense.

This argument from economy has certainly a very amiable aspect, and is one not unlikely to have weight with so frugal a people as the inhabitants of Manchester generally are; we beg leave to make an observation or two, however, for their consideration.

And first, this argument is totally inconsistent with the great and leading plea employed by Mr. Richson in behalf of his bill, namely, charity. In the beginning the burden of his song was, “the people of Manchester are poor, and want eleemosynary aid to educate their children; therefore allow a school rate as an act of charity.” Now the tune is altered, and our melodious bird sings, “there is among the people of Manchester a great deal of pauperism and crime, which cost you immense sums of money, and education will reform them; therefore grant a school rate to save your pockets.” The ever shifting character of this appeal amuses us somewhat. Nothing is fixed in it but one term, a school rate; all things else vary, but, however dissimilar, they are made to contribute to the common object. Whether liberal charity, large economy, or common convenience, supply the argument, there must be a school rate. That is a foregone conclusion. Mr. Richson must not be angry, however, if we still ask him which it is to be. Are we to open our purses in charity to the poor, or to draw them tighter by refusing to spend so much upon union houses and prisons?

Another reply to this, however, was given by Mr. Baines, in answer to another member of the Committee.

1856. *Mr. Brotherton (to Mr. Baines).*—Do we not at present pay about two millions a year for the punishment of crime, and for the support of property [paupers], that might in a great measure be prevented by education?

Ans.—We pay a great deal for the punishment of crime and the support of property [paupers].

1857. That is more oppressive than a payment for education I should conceive?

Ans.—I am not prepared to measure that. It would be vain to suppose that either our workhouses, or our gaols, or our police, could be dispensed with under any system of education whatever.

We further observe that we are by no means satisfied of the efficacy of education, as either a remedy for pauperism or a preventive of crime. We recollect that a few years ago this passed current as sound philosophy, and that for a time it was unchallenged; that time is gone by, however, and

we wonder that Mr. Richson has retained the exploded notion. It was evidently not prevalent in the Committee, and we do not think it needful, consequently, to go far into the subject. We shall however give a few extracts from the evidence.

1628. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Baines).*—An opinion has been expressed by a person having great opportunity of observation, I allude to the Chaplain of Pentonville Prison, who says in the Report of 1849: "I am compelled again to confess, that the proportion of convicts who have been educated in some sort of school to the uneducated, is fully as high as that which exists between those classes in the general population; a fact which should lead to the inquiry wherein the popular education is defective." Do you dispute his fact, or his inference?

Ans.—I do not dispute either his fact or his inference; but if the Committee will permit me, I will read a still later Report from the same gentleman, Mr. J. Kingsmill, relative to Pentonville Prison. He says in the last Report published, "The value of education, both as an element of civilization, and as a means to the intelligent perusal of God's word, is very great. Apart from a sound religious basis, however, it is shown in our every day experience to be of no worth, and not unfrequently the cause of more serious crimes; I mean more serious in the matters of property, in the amount abstracted, and in the violation of trust reposed in the individual. The previous educational advantages of convicts have been certainly higher, according to our experience, than in the general population. Thus in 3,000 convicts who have passed from this prison, I find 2,441 have attended some sort of school, some of them the very highest in the country." I state that as serving to show that it would be vain to expect that education would entirely prevent crime.

Together with an improvement in the education of criminals, however, there is found to be a diminution of crime.

1708. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).*—Can you lay before the Committee (confining yourself to Manchester) any facts showing whether crime has increased or diminished within the last 10 years, beginning with 1840?

Ans.—I have examined Captain Willis's police returns for the Borough of Manchester for the last 12 years. They show a considerable diminution in crime, and an improvement in the degree of instruction of the criminals. The number of persons apprehended was 12,417 in 1840, and 4,890 in 1851.

1709. Can you state whether the numbers in the year 1840 were from any special cause unusually large, or whether they were very much like the numbers in 1841 and 1842, and whether the diminution, coming down to between 4,000 and 5,000, has been steady, and almost without exception a constant annual diminution?

Ans.—It has been a steady, and almost without exception a constant annual diminution. At the same time, in reference to the first part of the question, I must say, I do believe that the number of persons apprehended in the earlier years was considerably larger, in consequence of the much higher degree of strictness on the part of the police at that time than exists at present.

1710. Is it not the fact that, in the years 1840 and 1841, and up to the harvest of 1842, the price of food was unusually high, and the sufferings of the people in Manchester, and in that district, unusually great?

Ans.—It was so.

1711. You would conclude, then, that, however much education in Manchester may bear upon this question, the increased comforts of the people are also to be taken into the account?

Ans.—I believe largely.

1712. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Was not the state of trade at that period very bad?

Ans.—Yes: in 1840 and 1842.

1713. May not the state of trade have had just as much to do with it as the high price of bread?

Ans.—I think the two things are connected together.

These questions exhibit to the reader an example of what was not infrequent in the Committee, a friendly sparring between the advocates and the opponents of free trade. Of the latter class Mr. W. Miles is one of the staunchest survivors, and he generally took good care, as in this instance, to keep Mr. Bright and his other enemies in check. We thank them both, however, for they rendered common service to the cause of education.

Mr. Baines (1717) then gives some details showing the relation of crime to education, which Mr. Fox (1718) thus sums up: "In any mode of classification this result obtains, that the per centage of crime diminishes in the case of the totally uninstructed, and also in the case of the well instructed; but that it increases, and increases largely, in the case of the imperfectly instructed." So much for the effect of education! This general conclusion, however, was held subject to a slight modification.

1724. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Baines).*—If of the whole number of prisoners apprehended or convicted in Manchester, the per centage of those uneducated is much fewer, and the number of imperfectly educated much larger, does that, in your opinion, afford a fair proof that, although education may not have advanced to the point at which we wish to see it, still it is steadily advancing and improving in that district?

Ans.—Yes; I think so.

1725. *Mr. Ker Seymer.*—Taken together with the diminution of crime, does not it tell on the whole in favour of education?

Ans.—I think so.

We make Mr. Richson welcome to this small allowance, for which we hope he will be thankful. We cannot conclude our remarks, however, without observing, that whatever the effect of education might be in diminishing pauperism and crime, and whatever the force of an argument thence derived for the extension of education, no argument is hence derivable in favour of the local scheme, or of a school rate.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE RIGHT OF SOCIETY.

Another argument of a general kind, not adduced by Mr. Richson, but brought forward by a member of the Committee and a leading educational philanthropist, is indicated by the heading of this chapter. It was thus introduced.

2488. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Adshead).*—When you speak of the voluntary principle as applied to parents, do you mean that a parent is not morally bound to educate his child?

Ans.—I believe that a parent is morally bound to educate his child, and I think that any interference with that moral responsibility is not right.

2489. Has not society an interest in his fulfilment of that duty?

Ans.—No doubt, society has an interest; but I think that society has no right unjustly to interfere between me and my child.

2490. If society has an interest in the parent's fulfilment of that duty, may it not interpose so far as to see that the duty is not neglected, to the injury alike of the child and of the community?

Ans.—Yes: but if society comes to me, and says to me, "Let me educate your child," I should say to society, "Mind your own business."

2491. May not society insist upon the child being educated, without undertaking to educate it, or prescribing how it shall be educated ?

Ans.—If any act were passed to say that my child should go to school, and that if it did not go to school it should be subject to a penalty, I should probably be compelled to submit.

2492. You think that the right of society does not extend so far ?

Ans.—Certainly not.

2493. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Would not that do away entirely with voluntary action on the part of the parent ?

Ans.—Yes, altogether.

There peeps out in these questions of Mr. Fox, one of the principles of social and political economy which lie, deep and broad, beneath the whole of the Manchester educational movement. Society, it seems, has a right to see to the execution of everything in which it has an interest, and consequently to the education of children. We do not hesitate to pronounce this general notion a glittering fallacy. It looks wise, but it is essential foolishness. Society, whatever conception may be formed of this vague but convenient impersonation, has an interest in ten thousand things which it has never dreamt of looking after, or of having a right to look after, by act of parliament ; and profounder statesmen than Mr. Fox have long ago ranked among leading political truths the dictate of experience and common sense, that there are at work a thousand influences by which society does much more and better for itself than legislative interference could possibly do. Why should education be taken out of this category ?

CHAPTER XIX.

THE PETITIONS.

As a mode of favouring their respective designs in parliament, the advocates of both the local and secular schemes caused petitions to be circulated, and signatures to be solicited, throughout the school district. First in the field were the locals, whose petition was signed by 40,000 rate-payers ; but after them came the seculars, and their petition was signed by 60,000 inhabitants. Mr. Entwisle naturally lays considerable stress on the fact that a petition so numerously signed had been presented in favour of the local bill ; and he claims the weight of the secular petition, as aiding to establish “a large preponderance of public opinion in Manchester, as to the deficiency of the existing means of education, and their assent to the principle of the supply of that deficiency by means of a rate upon property,” (1128).

A word or two first on the former of these petitions. Mr. Adshead, in giving an account of the discussion in the Manchester town council (2277), cited the following words from the speech of Mr. Alderman Bancroft.

“Remarking upon the petition to which reference has so frequently been made before the Committee, he observed, that he understood the signatures to the petition for the bill had been obtained towards the close at a cost of 4d. each ; and he could get 40,000 signatures for any plausible object by employing ten or twelve (men) on such terms, and indeed for less.”

This, not without reason, called up the opposite party, and Mr. Frederic Peel was brought forward, to give the best explanation he might. This

gentleman's examination is to be found from 2401 to 2407, but we need not give it in detail. He expressly admits the fact as alleged by Alderman Bancroft, and his explanation is, that this was not an excessive remuneration to the canvassers, the other signatures having in fact cost 6d. a head. The thing, in truth, had been done on a principle of frugality, as they had gone about the petition in a very expensive way, and had already spent upon it no less than £1,000. Indeed, it had not paid the men so well as the general canvass, as they had previously been paid 5s. a day, and on the capitation system they earned on an average but 3s. 11d.

We have no wish to press hard on Mr. Peel and his friends in this matter, but we must say, that, in our judgment, this is not telling the whole truth. It must in the nature of things have been otherwise. The object of paying the canvassers so much for every signature obtained, rather than so much for every hour spent, was not to spend less money, but to get more names, not to pay less for labour, but to make labour more fruitful of results. It was to sharpen their wits, and increase their importunity; to make them resolved, in a word, to get names at all hazards, since, if they got no signatures, they got no pay. Men in such circumstances cannot but have been zealous.

There are, however, 40,000 signatures appended to a petition on behalf of the local bill, and 60,000 signatures to a petition against it, both being in common in favour of a school rate. "You are assuming," said Mr. Bright, to Mr. Entwisle, (1132), that these are "different persons altogether." A very important assumption truly, and on a matter very worthy of investigation. We have reason to believe, (although it is not stated in the evidence), that a large proportion of the 60,000 who signed the second petition were actually the same persons who signed the first, and that they signed it the more eagerly in order to neutralize the sanction which they had given unawares to the peculiarities of the Local scheme. Were the two lists corrected and formed into one, there can be no doubt of this apparently formidable number being considerably reduced.

The significance of the Petitions is liable to a still greater reduction than the number of signatures. It is not, indeed, to be supposed that a hundred thousand persons, or half that number, being rate payers and inhabitants of Manchester and Salford, actually made themselves acquainted with the various important and difficult questions involved in this educational movement, or that the "50 or more canvassers who were paid to get signatures" were very capable of enlightening them. Mr. Entwisle admitted that the Committee did nothing to qualify these worthy persons for such a task, beyond "furnishing them with some printed papers of instructions, particularly one epitomizing the proposals and the general effect of the bill, drawn up by our society," (1131). Of this we shall speak presently, but now let our readers hear Mr. Bright.

1132. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Entwisle).*—Is it not your opinion that, with regard to the 60,000, and with regard to by far the largest portion of the 40,000 who signed your petition, the whole of these signatures may be taken merely to represent their general opinion that the existing means of education are deficient, and that they have no objection to those means being made up by a rate; but they are not fairly to be taken at all to represent how the religious difficulty is to be got over, and not at all to represent that difficulties should be thrown in the way of Catholics and Jews entering these schools, and they are not at all intended to represent the opinion that the people are indifferent to the payment of money for teaching the various modes of religion held by the people of

Manchester and Salford, some of which are held to be very erroneous and very false? How far do you believe that these petitions represent that more general opinion, or an opinion on those special points to which I have referred?

Ans.—I have very little doubt, from the pains that were taken upon various occasions to explain the general scope of the bill now before the House, that a considerable number of the ratepayers who have signed our petition have signed it with a general knowledge of the principles which it involved; but I am quite willing to admit my belief, that, speaking generally, it would be to overstrain the importance of such petitions, if it were imagined that the whole, or the majority of the signatures, were given with a thorough knowledge of all the points at issue.

Mr. Bright subsequently took notice of the Instructions to Canvassers, and referring to No. 8, (which states that “No Schools will be excluded from the benefit of the rate on account of their connexion with any religious community, but that all will be admitted on equal terms,”) in connexion with the restriction as to rate-built schools, asked, “Do not you think, that in these clauses, you offered an inducement to the people of Manchester to sign your petition, which inducement you have not carried out in the clauses of your bill?” To this Mr. Entwisle answers, and in our opinion justly, “I do not think so,” (1139). The fault of the Instructions is, not that they are intentionally deceptive, but that they are too brief and dogmatical not to be practically so. They assume and assert, what no attempt is made to prove, or even to explain, and so, we have no doubt, they have misled many. To say that in such a document nothing more was possible, is only to confess that the effect of its circulation affords small ground for congratulation or confidence.

PART II.

DETAILS OF THE LOCAL BILL.

CHAPTER I.

THE BILL SUPERFLUOUS, COSTLY, UNJUST, UNCHARITABLE, AND
PAUPERIZING.

As it was allotted to Mr. Richson to make out the case of the advocates of the Local bill, and to present a statement of the facts on which it is grounded, so it was assigned to Mr. Entwisle to bring forward the principal features of the bill itself, and to show the applicability of the measure embodied in it. To this part of the examination we proceed to give our attention.

Mr. Entwisle commences his evidence with an account of the formation and progress of the Manchester and Salford School Committee, and then states "the main principles which they had in view" in the preparation of their scheme. We do not know that we need trouble ourselves to state these precisely in his own words. It is sufficient to say, that the object of the Committee was to secure for education a religious character; to avail themselves of existing schools; to make education gratuitous, the payment being provided for by a rate; to make schools open to all, up to their capacity for the reception of pupils; to provide for liberty of conscience, for the erection of new schools, and for school inspection; and to place the whole under the administration of the town councils of Manchester and Salford, subject to the control of the Committee of Council in London, (656, 674).

It will not be needful for us to go into all these particulars. In some of them we most cordially concur, as in the necessity of popular education being religious, and in the wisdom of upholding existing schools. On the professedly gratuitous character of the education to be given we have already spoken our mind, and as to the right of admission for all, we have only to say that we think it adds to the present system, either nothing, or something of very doubtful value. We have also little to say on the subject of inspection. Objections to the measure, either as a whole or in some of its parts, we have, and we will proceed to state them.

The bill is clearly objectionable in the first place, as a piece of superfluous legislation. It is an established maxim of political wisdom not to legislate without necessity. Now here is no necessity. No case has been made out for it. Something is to be done, indeed—we may even say, much—in advancing the cause of popular education; but the effectuation of this

object does not require any act of parliament. The object can be attained, and better attained, without it. The bill is consequently foolish.

In the next place, it is a very costly folly. It involves the imposition of a school-rate, amounting for the contemplated district to the large sum of £32,470 per annum, (Mr. Richson's evidence, Table 35).

Let the good people of Manchester and Salford ponder this. An additional assessment of nearly three and thirty thousand pounds a year, under the sweet name of "eleemosynary aid" to their neighbours "in procuring education!" And this we are candidly assured is only "for two or three years;" just a mouthful, a *bonne bouche*, for those who are not only likely, but sure, to want more, much more, before their appetite for sweets shall be satiated. But to go into detail under the guidance of Mr. Richson.

Mr. Richson states the expenditure which the adoption of the local scheme would involve only hypothetically. In the first place, he forms an estimate of the proportion of children whose education is now paid for by their parents at the public schools (Church of England, British, and Denominational) which would probably become chargeable on the rate, and these he sets down at 18,211. These, at the proposed remuneration of 20s. a year for each boy and 16s. a year for girls, will cost £15,934. If, then, this number of children attending school can be increased by one-half, or 50 per cent., and so raised to 27,316, the education of the whole will cost £23,901. To defray this expense Mr. Richson proposes a rate upon property in the school district of 6d. in the pound, which amounts in the gross to £32,470; and in net produce, if 20 per cent. be deducted for charges of collection and other drawbacks, to £25,976.

Upon this scheme it is obvious to observe, in the first place, that it makes to be paid for by the rate the education of 18,211 children which is now paid for by the parents themselves; a change very much for the worse in all respects, but palpably so in the particular which we have now before us, namely the cost, which may be stated at £16,000. Here, then, is a net revenue of £16,000 a year to be spent upon getting that done by taxation which is already done, and better done, by voluntary payment. In addition to this is the cost of collection, which, upon a sixpenny rate, as we are informed, is about £1,000. This, of course, is a pure loss. It is, in truth, too plain to be denied, that the cheapest way of paying for the education of children is for every parent to pay directly for his own, and that the substitution of any public machinery must be a piece of absolute and uncompensated waste.

And, after all this cost, what would be achieved? An augmentation in the common elementary schools of 9000 scholars. Why, Mr. Richson has been dinning it into our ears that there are in the district 57,000 children of the working classes who do not go to school, and that one half of these at least, that is, 28,500, ought to be there; and now he and his friends bring forward a scheme the widest scope of which is to gain the attendance of less than one-third of this number, at a cost of £30,000 a year! Pray what is to be done with the other 19,500? Is a further £20,000 a year to be raised by taxation for them? We are aware that the numbers we have quoted from Mr. Richson are fabulous, but it is fair to measure a remedy propounded by its author's statement of the case for which it is intended.

Extravagant and inefficient as a school rate would be, the scheme is singularly charged with elements of partiality and injustice.

Mr. Richson calculates that nearly a thousand (939) children whose parents now pay for their education would not be put upon the rate, partly because it is not intended to receive infants under four years old, and partly from conscientious or prudential objections. Here, therefore, is a large body of worthy, and three fifths of them poor persons—so poor, by Mr. Richson's own showing, as to need eleemosynary assistance in the schooling of their children—to whom the rate would be, not only an unmitigated, but an aggravated burden. And, in addition to this, many poor persons—very poor—would have to pay the school rate, or its representative rent, who have no children to educate—bachelors, spinsters, widows, married people without children, or with children grown up—already poor enough, and heavily taxed enough, and yet to be compelled to pay another tax, to educate not their own children but their neighbours', who are no poorer than themselves. This general ground of objection to a school rate is well set forth by Mr. Baines.

1855. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—Have you objections to that [taxing the whole community for the benefit of only a part] on what may be called economical grounds?

Ans.—I conceive there is an objection to it, both to its injustice and its inexpediency. You tax the whole community for the benefit of only a part. The rate must raise rents, if not at first, ultimately. It will therefore not be a tax on property, but on persons; a householder's tax. It will press on all alike, the aged, the widow, the unmarried female; this is unnatural. Nature has ordained that men should have the burden of their children just at the period of the greatest vigour, strength, and spirits, that is, when they are best able to bear it, and when the burden is pleasing, and its own reward; but this measure would extend the burden over the whole of life, when there was no motive for sustaining it. Such an artificial proceeding is empirical. It must rest on the principle of communism, in opposition to the individual and competitive system; accordingly the communists are found to be the most ardent supporters of the principle, though not of a religious education. It is undesirable to increase the weight of public taxation; all taxes are paid grudgingly, and to aggravate them would be a premium on discontent.

The injustice of this scheme further appears in its partiality. Nothing can be more clear than the correctness of the principle laid down in the following question.

762. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Entwisle).*—In a local rate generally collected, if you collect it from any individual, surely you ought to give him the benefit of that rate?

Ans.—We desire to do so.

763. Still from the answers which you have given to the Committee, it would appear that some persons would be excluded from that, though you take the rate from them?

Ans.—I think, to the best of my knowledge, that it might result that some Roman Catholic schools might be excluded.

To these Mr. Entwisle might have added some Jewish schools, which did not then, perhaps, occur to his memory. But upon this matter Mr. Richson opens to us a wider field of observation.

222. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Richson).*—Generally speaking, are you prepared to say that the persons whom, or the proportion of public feeling that you are assumed to represent here, would wish that whatever was done should be done so that every branch of the population, every class and sect and section of the

population, should derive equal benefit from any system of schools which parliament might be induced to sanction?

Ans.—I do not think that I could go so far as to say, that the persons with whom I have the pleasure of cooperating would extend that principle so far that every one should have equal rights.

Hear! Hear! Who, then, is not to have equal rights, Mr. Richson?

Answer continued.—For instance, take a socialist. I do not think that my friends—certainly I say myself—should be disposed* to say that the socialists should set up a school, and have the same rights, and the same advantages, and be supported in the same way as other persons.

We are far from imputing to Mr. Richson any special feeling of hostility to socialists. They are named, we are sure, merely as an example of a much wider class, namely, that of unbelievers, more or less avowed, in Christianity. He will have an education “based on the Bible.” For this, however, he will exact the rate from *all*, of every form of infidelity and misbelief! Mr. Miles, you do not think this just; neither do we.

Further, this benevolent scheme is not less uncharitable than it is unjust. Its main object is avowedly to supply eleemosynary aid to the poor in procuring education; yet it makes the very persons who are to receive aid pay the aid they are to receive, while the aid itself is to be received in a method which exhausts all the charity out of it. A school rate would have no benevolence in it. It would, like all rates, be assessed by magistrates, levied by public officers, enforced by law, (perhaps by distraint,) distributed without kindness, and received without gratitude. It would be but another poor law; and no one who is acquainted with the working of that system would wish to enlarge it. Why should charitable assistance be rendered in a method which can neither exhibit kindness nor awaken gratitude, and benevolence be neutralized by being administered through the hardest and coldest official forms?

It must be added that the rating scheme is not only superfluous, extravagant, unjust, and uncharitable, but that it would also be positively pernicious.* We must here recall to the recollection of our readers an answer given by Mr. Richson, to which we promised a second reference.

638. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Richson).*—Are the Committee to understand the whole of your system to be laid down upon this principle, that it is necessary to find for the poorer population of Manchester a gratuitous school education?

Ans.—I think so: conditionally that it does not pauperize the people.

This is well said, Mr. Richson, and presents at least one point of agreement between us. You yourself, then, admit that it is not desirable to “pauperize the people,” but that this would, on the contrary, be an evil much to be deprecated, and carefully to be avoided. You would even rather sacrifice your favourite measure than do anything tending to such an issue. But now, will you kindly show us how your condition can be secured, and how it is possible to carry out your plan without pauperizing the people, and that to an unprecedented extent?

Let us understand, however, what is the meaning of this expression. A pauper is a man who, on the ground, real or alleged, of being unable to supply his own wants, has his wants supplied out of a public fund. This social position tends to generate in him a state of mind corresponding with its own character. It gradually undermines, and ultimately destroys, his spirit of independence and self-reliance, together with his habits of industry

* Erroneously printed “should not be disposed”

and frugality, and breeds in him the spirit of a pauper. Others must provide for him ; therefore he need exercise no forethought, no thrift, no economy : and why should he work, at least any harder than he must, since he has neither expenses to pay, nor earnings to receive ? Such is the spirit of pauperism, the most noxious social element which it is possible to conceive ; and to pauperize a man, is to treat him in such a manner as shall tend to produce this spirit.

Now, the direct and sure way to generate in a man the spirit of pauperism is to treat him as a pauper ; that is to say, to begin to supply his wants out of public funds. This has been found so strongly to operate under the poor law, that it has necessitated, as a measure of inevitable but severe wisdom, the administration of public benevolence on a principle of hard-heartedness. It is the acknowledged duty of relieving officers, not to indulge themselves in the luxury of giving freely, but narrowly to scrutinize every case, to send away applicants whenever they can, and to give relief only where they must. All this lest they should "pauperize the people," and generate in them a habit of leaning so strongly on a public fund as to abandon a course of industry, or to lose the spirit of self-reliance.

Precisely similar will be the operation of a school rate, assuming it to be what Mr. Richson represents it, an eleemosynary measure. Its language will be such as this :—"There, now you are no longer in any difficulty. The schooling of your children shall be paid for by the public, and you are no longer under parental responsibility concerning their education. You need not now work an extra hour or two to earn the school pence, nor deny yourself the extra pint of ale for a similar purpose. As to this matter, be as idle and reckless as you like, the education of your children will go on the same. The rate will pay for that !" How is it possible, we ask, that such a process as this should go on without "pauperizing the people," that is to say, without accustoming them to look to a public fund for that which it is both just and important they should strive to supply for themselves ?

And let it be observed, that this pernicious and deteriorating effect will be by no means confined to those whom Mr. Richson conceives to be in want of eleemosynary aid. It will indeed be a mischief of no small extent, if only the parents of the 9,000 fresh children whom he hopes to get to school should be thus initiated into the spirit of pauperism ; but his plan will carry the evil much further. The parents of the 18,000 children whose education is now paid for will be subjected to the same process, for they will have the benefit of the rate ; and thus a large number of respectable people, who have long striven hard, and hitherto successfully, to bear up under family burdens, and by industry and thrift to maintain their independence, will be thrown for the first time upon a public charity, and be made paupers of at once. To us it is marvellous that this direct and inevitable result of his measure should have escaped Mr. Richson's observation. A more palpably mischievous scheme of charity, in our judgment, it is difficult to conceive ; and, if it be really an essential condition of Mr. Richson's support of it that it shall not pauperize the people, we should think he would at once abandon it.

CHAPTER II.

THE BILL DESTRUCTIVE TO EFFORTS ON THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.

It is a fact which ought by no means to be forgotten, that the local scheme is, if its authors can have their way, to be put into operation, not in a field hitherto neglected and unoccupied, but in one on which a large amount of labour has been already bestowed, and in which cultivation has made considerable and gratifying advances. Schools on the voluntary system (exclusive or modified) are, in Manchester and Salford, both numerous and effective; and the question is really of no small importance, what, under this bill, is to become of them? To extinguish, or materially to injure them, would be to inflict not only a severe mortification on the benevolent persons who have hitherto so liberally and sedulously cherished them, but a heavy, and perhaps irreparable calamity on the community at large.

Now it is obvious that the Local measure threatens very serious injury, if not total annihilation, to educational efforts on the voluntary system. It is natural that this should be a consideration of great weight with those who have not merely publicly declared their principles in this respect, but who have also expended much, both of money and energy, on the practical development of them; nor do we think that others would look with complacency on the extinction, interruption, or even embarrassment, of the extensive and valuable operations which are being carried on by the voluntary educationists.

This subject was introduced in the Committee by Mr. Peto.

608. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Richson).*—Would the introduction of a system of gratuitous education be favourable to this earnest and successful cause of voluntary effort, as far as it has gone?

Ans.—I think that, if it were provided for by means of a rate upon the principle of the poor rate, it would immensely stimulate voluntary effort.

609. And not altogether supersede it?

Ans.—Recollect I have said that it would increase the school attendance.

610. Speaking generally of voluntary effort in buildings and contributions, would not the carrying out of your plan with regard to placing all these schools on the rates altogether, have the effect of deadening and annihilating voluntary effort?

Ans.—Not at all. I think voluntary effort is not capable of supporting day schools; but it is capable of supporting Sunday schools, and of building schools. I think the more you could supply the children requiring school accommodation, the more would voluntary effort be stimulated.

611. As to the day schools, your plan would altogether extinguish voluntary effort, would it not?

Ans.—No.

612. Then is it your decided opinion, that, placing the whole of the day schools of Manchester upon the rates, and allowing them to be supported from the rates, would increase, rather than diminish voluntary effort?

Ans.—I think that you would never induce all schools to be placed on the rates under any circumstances; but the rivalry that would continue would tend, in my opinion, to stimulate school attendance, and voluntary effort also.

We are bound to acknowledge the goodwill towards schools on the volun-

tary system, which may be understood to breathe in these remarks. Mr. Richson thinks they would, at all events, suffer no harm. The matter, however, will bear looking at a little more closely.

The first blush of the case is this. We suppose an act of parliament to be passed, enacting the imposition of a school rate, and providing that every school in the district either aided or aidable (let us be allowed to coin this word) by the Committee of Council may be placed on the rate, so that its master or managers should receive 20s. for every boy and 16s. for every girl, within specified ages, whose attendance thereat was duly certified. This certainly presents temptations of no ordinary kind to a school to place itself on the rate, and it cannot be doubted that a large majority of the schools would do so. Mr. Richson thinks, however, that some schools would hold out, and perhaps he is right. Now the question relates exclusively to the condition of these schools, inasmuch as they would be the only ones then conducted on the voluntary principle. Could they go on? In other words, would children come to them? Why should parents send their children to schools at which they must pay the pence, when they may send them to schools equally good where the pence will be paid for them? Especially since they have already paid the money once in the shape of the rate, and may be little disposed to pay it a second time? To suppose such a process seems to us to overlook the elements really at work, and to conceive a state of things altogether incompatible with their inevitable result. Mr. Richson talks of "rivalry" between schools on the rate and voluntary schools, but will he show us how the voluntary schools can be kept open when no children will go to them? The plain truth is, that schools which will not go on the rate must shut up their doors, and Mr. Richson would have shown more candour if he had admitted it. A lurking consciousness of it is indicated by his answer 610, where he pretty distinctly assigns to the voluntary principle the limited sphere, first, of supporting Sunday schools, and, secondly, of erecting schoolrooms for the new scholars whom the rate may provide. How far it may be wise for statesmen and philanthropists who handle the subject of popular education, to extinguish all schools whose managers will not place them on the rate, and to apply this rough and perilous check to present educational efforts, is a question worthy of grave consideration.

Mr. Entwisle is somewhat more candid on this point than Mr. Richson.

1272. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Entwisle).*—Do not you consider that the fact of placing all schools upon the rates would tend very greatly to check that energy which is so much developed in voluntary efforts at the present time?

Ans.—That it would, to some extent, lessen voluntary contributions cannot be denied; but . . . I think if we promise them support by this bill, we shall supply the energy which has been displayed by voluntary effort by much better means.

1273. Still it would naturally have the tendency which I have pointed out?

Ans.—No doubt.

The truth was distinctly brought out, however, by Mr. W. Miles, in a question to Mr. Baines.

1556. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Baines).*—To put a case, take an entirely free school, with a competent master and assistants, and take in the same locality a school in which the children would have to pay 3d. a week for education; which of these two schools do you think would be better attended by the population of the district?

Ans.—Of these two schools there can be no doubt that the free school placed by the side of the paid school, and being equally good, must naturally destroy the paid school.

Let the friends of voluntary education, therefore, see what is before them, and judge in good time whether they think the proposed system of parish relief (which is their only alternative) a “much better means” of supplying the energy hitherto developed by voluntary effort.

This, however, is not all. The levying of a school-rate would undoubtedly have the effect of diminishing, and almost annihilating the exercise of voluntary liberality. Mr. Baines, in his answer 1904, gives some extracts from a speech of Lord Brougham in the House of Lords, on the 23rd of May, 1835, which have lost no more of their truth than of their eloquence. We cite a single sentence.

Let the tax gatherer, said his lordship, or the county assessor, or the parish collector, but once go his rounds for a school-rate, and I will answer for it that the voluntary assistance of men in themselves benevolent, and indeed munificent, instead of increasing, will soon vanish away; that the 144,000 now educated at unendowed schools will speedily fall down to almost nothing, and that the adoption of such a fatal and heedless course will sweep away those establishments which at present reflect so much honour on the community, which do so much good, and are calculated, with judicious management, to do so much more.

CHAPTER III.

THE BILL ENTAILS GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

It has been clearly seen by thoughtful men of all classes, that the question of popular education does not stand alone, but that it is closely linked with social influences of the greatest importance; so closely, indeed, that to have the command of general education is to become a leading, if not a supreme social and political power. Hence have sprung so many efforts, not merely to educate the masses, but to monopolize their education; an aim in which it is certainly most important to the common welfare that all and every party should be defeated. Left free among themselves, educational parties neutralize each other; no party can monopolize education without becoming a national and intolerable pest.

Another ground of objection to the bill consequently, is to be found in the vast influence over the education of the country which it would throw into the hands of the government. This was brought forward in the following part of Mr. Baines's examination.

1834. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—Has it been much objected to the bill, or do you much object to it, on the ground of its centralizing in the Government and the Committee of Privy Council on Education, the control and management of education?

Ans.—Yes. More than one of the petitions that I have referred to and quoted declares there is a great objection on that ground, that this bill would centralize in the government of the day the control and management of all the education of the country.

1835. Does the bill enable the Committee of Privy Council to decide on the

mode of instruction, or the books to be read, or the branches of education that shall be studied?

Ans.—I will state the powers which the Committee of Privy Council would have according to this bill. The Committee of Privy Council would, by clause 15, have to sanction the bye-laws and regulations of the municipal school Committee, and by clause 52, to appoint the inspectors.

1837. *Mr Fox.*—Would not the work of inspection be most likely to be impartially done by an inspector appointed by an independent authority?

Ans.—It might be impartially done, but there might be an objection to it. The objections I was going to state are these—that they put, by means of their inspection, the whole control and management of the schools in the hands of the Government. The bill provides, that the Privy Council are not only to sanction the bye-laws and regulations of the Municipal School Committee, but also to appoint the inspectors; to give the certificates which are indispensable to every schoolmaster; to sanction every new school; to sanction every grant for the repair of premises; to assent to any new school trust that may be required, and to the selling, letting, or exchanging of school premises; to make or withhold grants to teachers, apprentices, and monitors, at their pleasure; to grant or withhold books, maps, and school apparatus; and to be a final court of appeal in all complaints against the Municipal School Committee, or the Inspector.

In a subsequent answer Mr. Baines gave further expression to his views upon this matter.

1850. I wish to submit to the Committee, that the governmental control over the education of the country is open to great objections. First, wrong in principle; that it is not expedient or safe for government to act as the teacher. If it does so in schools, it may in chapels and the press, may make grants to editors of newspapers and to authors, and take all literature and science into its pay; it may as reasonably provide every family with reading, as with schooling; may superintend Sunday schools, mechanics' institutions, news-rooms, reading-rooms, &c. Secondly, there would be a dangerous extension of government patronage and influence, extending to all school committees, schoolmasters, pupil teachers, stipendiary monitors, officers of normal schools, &c. If we have 50,000 schools, there might be 100,000 persons brought under the influence, and a very great number under actual pay, of the government. This, I conceive, would create a bureaucracy in this country, like those of the continent, hostile to the spirit of our institutions, hateful to the people, and destructive of self-reliance. Moreover, I consider that that interference on the part of government to manage and control education would be injurious to education, and obstructive of improvement. I admit that the government have power to educate, as they do in other countries, and that they have power to retain in their pay men of the most distinguished ability, and that they have the power to do that just as they have the power to protect industry and the press, and interfere in the regulations of every family. But, as was observed by the Marquis of Lansdowne, 'It is universally admitted that governments are the worst of cultivators, the worst of manufacturers, and the worst of traders.' I believe that these defects in government management are to be ascribed to causes which are pretty obvious. There is a tendency in governments to stagnation, to jobbing; when an unwieldy machinery has been created there is a difficulty in effecting changes. All experience declares that freedom and competition are the best safeguards for improvement. And finally, I conceive that it is not really desirable for government itself, or for parliament, to have that power. It is a great but a most troublesome and invidious power, opening subjects of endless contention in parliament.

It became manifest to the Committee from the answers given by Mr. Baines, that the objections adduced by him against the bill had a still wider range, and applied equally "to the existing system of the Committee of Privy Council on Education," 1449; and this led to some examination on the subject of the Parliamentary grant,

1742. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—Do you object to the Parliamentary grant on principle?

Ans.—I object to the Parliamentary grant upon principle.

1743.—Do you think that the educational system of this country, as it now exists, would not be the worse, but perhaps the better, if that grant were discontinued?

Ans.—I believe that in the long run it would be better.

1748. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—You spoke of the Government grant with respect to Manchester as being unimportant in amount?

Ans.—Yes.

1749. Do you think if the Government were to withdraw that grant altogether, that that portion of it which now goes to Manchester would be supplied by voluntary exertion?

Ans.—I do.

1750. Are you aware that the efficiency of the schools at present existing in Manchester very much depends upon the assistance afforded to make up the salaries of the masters and pupil teachers?

Ans.—I am aware that the efficiency of the education depends upon the number of the teachers of various kinds supplied.

1751. Assisted by the Government?

Ans.—That is the present system; but my belief is that, if no such grants were made, the education would be supplied, and that the number of teachers would be supplied. And whilst I have admitted on the former day of my examination, that, in the first instance, the probability is that the adoption of a new system may be attended with a certain degree of success, and give a certain amount of stimulus to education, yet, in the long run, my belief is that no system of governmental, or municipal, or parochial education will be nearly equal to a system that is perfectly free, and open to the unlimited competition of all religious bodies, and of all private individuals.

1754. *Marquis of Blandford.*—Do you not think that the system at present adopted by Parliamentary grant has this advantage, that it presents a union of the two systems, the one being voluntary and the other partially endowed; and has not the endowed system this effect, that it tends rather to provoke and call forth voluntary efforts, with the hope of their being rendered successful by means of that portion which is given by the state?

Ans.—Yes, in the first instance, but I think the effect afterwards is just what we see in Manchester. I look upon it, that in all probability it is a fact that these government grants, together with the inspectors exercising influence themselves, have caused the public of Manchester to look to the whole thing being done by the Government and by compulsion, instead of doing it themselves. That, I think, is the natural tendency. It is saying on the part of the Government, that whatever the public does not do we will do; and when that is said, the public will always take care to leave enough for Government to do.

Mr. Baines having incidentally said (1760) that “control must go along with the grant,” the following examination ensued.

1767. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Baines).*—You said that a grant necessarily implied control: does it of necessity imply any further interference than the very legitimate and useful one of inspection and report?

Ans.—My belief is that, naturally, you will find the paymaster to be the real master all the world over.

1768. As a matter of fact, has not the interference of the Committee of Privy Council with the schools been generally confined to inspection and report?

Ans.—I conceive that the system of instruction adopted in the schools which are under inspection is very greatly—indeed I was going to say at the mercy, but I do not use the term in any offensive sense—it is under the influence of the inspector; and according to the report of the inspector, and according to the satisfaction which he expresses, will be the grants that are made to the school and to the schoolmaster. Therefore, in point of fact, the inspectors,

under the present system, are the persons who have the power of determining what the course of instruction at those schools shall be.

1769. Do they determine that in any other way than by reporting what methods are pursued, and what the results of those methods are that are in progress? And is not that a very wholesome operation, and free from whatever is obnoxious in the notion of control?

Ans.—They do thus report; but when it is known to the schoolmaster that upon the certificate of the inspector will depend a portion of his income, he will, of course, feel that he is bound to follow the instructions of the inspector, and to adopt that system which may be agreeable to the inspector.

1770. What possible interest or object can an inspector have, beyond making a fair report, and by that report stimulating the most efficient methods of teaching that he witnesses?

Ans.—I do not say that he has any interest. All I say is that he does obtain the power, and that as the inspector obtains the power, the Committee of Privy Council, by whom he is appointed, obtains the power; and that tends to bring the whole education of the country, so far as it receives grants from Government, under the influence of Government.

The chairman having suggested that “a good many of these objections would be removed if the education was made merely municipal, and the management of the system merely municipal,” the following questions were proposed.

1852. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Baines)*—May not municipal control be equally objectionable to the conscience as Government control?

Ans.—It would be.

1853. If so, Protestant Dissenters would equally object to being put under municipal control and inspection, as they would under Government control?

Ans.—Their conscientious objections would be the same, and some of their other objections; but the political objections, to which I last referred, apply chiefly to centralizing in the Government of the day the whole control over the schools of the country.

1854. I need scarcely ask you whether, if it was put to the different Dissenters, they would not rather act conscientiously than politically; in other words, whether conscience would not have more effect upon them than particular political influences?

Ans.—The conscientious objections would be much more powerful with them than the political objections.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BILL CREATES A RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENT.

The most broad and intractable of all the questions incidental to educational progress, is that which relates to religion; but it is at the same time the most important, and it must not be evaded. The seculars, as if in desperation, are resolved on throwing religion altogether out of the scholastic routine, and committing it to extra-scholastic instructors; the locals, however, pursue a different course, and promise us, what they agree with us in declaring essentially important, a religious education. Beyond this point, however, our agreement does not extend. In all that relates to religion the bill is utterly vicious. Its provisions of this class are so numerous and important that we must devote to them several chapters; in the present chapter we deal with its tendency to create a religious endowment.

1168. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Entwisle)*.—So far as your system goes, you do

not interfere with denominational teaching in the smallest degree, except in your rate-built schools; you allow the teaching to go on in the present schools as it now does. All you wish is to open them to all classes of society, supposing that all classes of society wish to take advantage of them?

Ans.—Yes. We wish to retain the denominational character of the schools.

*1169.—The religious character of the schools is not to be the least altered?

Ans.—That is what we intend.

1171. *Mr. Fox.*—Is not the religious position of the schools altered in this respect, that whereas now the schools are merely instances of the voluntary principle, your plan will give to each of them what is equivalent to a theological endowment for their particular doctrines?

Ans.—I am aware that there is some section of the community who do put such a construction upon this application of the public money.

We confess ourselves of this number, and we think the objection a strong one, though Mr. Entwisle is pleased to make light of it. We disapprove decidedly of religious endowments at large, as strenuously repudiating them for ourselves as denying them to others, and therefore we object to a system of religious education out of the public purse, which is nothing short of a religious endowment. And it is so much the more disagreeable in this case, because it is an endowment, not for one sect of religionists, but for all. Some members of the Committee saw this.

1821. *Mr. Brotherton (to Mr. Baines).*—Is it not felt that the proposed system would be acting on the principle of universal endowment, and therefore tending to the teaching of that which many persons believe to be absolutely erroneous in religion?

Ans.—It is.

And the universal religious endowment thus created would bear very hard upon nonconformists in particular.

Would the Committee permit me, says Mr. Baines, to make another remark relative to the position in which many of the nonconformist bodies would be placed, and that is, that all the religious bodies holding these opinions would suffer extreme injustice from such a measure as this; because they would be compelled to pay for all kinds of religious teaching from which they dissent, whilst they could not conscientiously receive money for the teaching of their own views, (1821).

To this it may be added as a further aggravation of the case, that the bill, while endowing every form of nominal Christianity, makes no provision whatever for an education really religious. It has been from the first one of the great boasts of the promoters of the bill, that they would by it take security for the religious character of the education to be given, (959); but no profession was ever more fallacious. For the most part they have contrived to shift the burden of this responsibility from themselves to the Committee of Council, of whose arrangements in this matter we may have a word or two to say in the sequel; but for the present this question may be tested by the plan to be adopted in the rate-built schools, in which their own views are, of course, embodied. This point is brought out in the following passage:—

1838. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—To persons like yourself, who think it indispensable that religion should be taught along with secular education in the schools, has it been an objection that under this system there would be no security for religious teaching?

Ans.—Yes. I conceive there could be no security under the Bill for the religious character of the teacher of a rate-built school. The Committee of

Management appointed by the District School Committee must necessarily be selected on the principle of pleasing all sects, otherwise it would be a cause of perpetual dissatisfaction ; but such a committee would be likely to avoid any teacher of known decision of religious character, and would be too likely to compromise by choosing one of no religion at all ; there would not be the least security that the town council themselves will be religious persons. In the rate-built schools there could be no religious teaching worthy of the name.

On this subject however, let us hear the advocates of the Local bill themselves. Their regulation for these schools appears in clause 86, in the following terms :—"Provided that in every such school the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the authorized version shall always be provided for as a part of the daily instruction of the scholars." Let our readers now attend to the following part of Mr. Entwistle's examination.

910. *Mr. Gladstone (to Mr. Entwistle).*—Do you think that the terms of clause 86 as they stand can be said in any proper sense to provide for religious education ?

Ans.—I do not think it lays down any enactment which is complete in its terms to secure religious instruction to children so attending ; but I think it clearly defines the bounds within which religious instruction may be given, at the discretion of the managers and teachers of such schools.

922. Do you think if the reading of the Holy Scriptures was observed in those rate-built schools without any exposition of them, that the education given in them could be called a religious education ?

Ans.—No, I think not.

924. Then, with respect to what the clause enacts and enforces, it is the case, is it not, that it does not provide for a really religious education ?

Ans.—I think so, certainly.

This is a frank and fatal admission, at all events, as to the guarantee to be afforded by the bill that the education to be given shall be religious. But it seems that the clause allows of discretionary instruction within certain bounds. Let us proceed then, with the examination.

911. In order that the Committee may understand those bounds, am I right in supposing that your intention is to provide that the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the authorized version shall be compulsory, and that the exposition of the Holy Scriptures shall be permissive ?

Ans.—I apprehend that that is the effect of the clause.

912. If you leave the exposition of the Holy Scriptures to the option of the teachers or managers of a school, do you not conceive that such exposition would be made the means and the vehicle, or may be made the vehicle, of the particular doctrines or opinions which the teachers or managers may entertain ?

Ans.—I apprehend that that is necessarily the case.

Then, what, we ask, becomes of religion ? Under the form of an exposition of the Scriptures every mode of nominal christianity may be inculcated, the orthodox, the Socinian, the Protestant, the Papist ; nay, any phase of unbelief may be presented under a similar form. A sceptical schoolmaster may, with the bible in his hand as the professed source of his instructions, imbue the minds of his pupils with the scepticism which prevails in his own. He not only may, but he must. His own sentiments will inevitably leaven his communications, and give the tone to his lessons. None but a religious man can impart a really religious education ; a benefit for which, consequently, neither this nor any other act of parliament can give any thing approaching to a guarantee.

And if this is the case with respect to the schools in which the pro-

moters of the bill have embodied their own plan, it is not less so in the instances in which they have availed themselves of the decisions of the Committee of Council. This body, indeed, professes to patronize exclusively a religious education; but it accepts as a sufficient guarantee for this a connexion between the school and any known religious body—whether orthodox or Socinian, Protestant or Papist, Christian or Jewish; and in default of such connexion it requires only a daily reading of the scriptures in the authorized version. This is merely using the name of religion as a veil to blind the eyes, and as a condiment to render palatable what would else be too nauseous to be swallowed.

CHAPTER V.

THE BILL PROVIDES UNSATISFACTORILY FOR NEW SCHOOLS.

The religious difficulty, of one aspect of which we treated in the preceding chapter, presents itself again in connexion with the provision made by the bill for the contingent and remote, but very possible, erection of additional school buildings. This is brought out in the following manner.

1852. *Chairman (to Mr. Entwisle).*—What provision does your association propose to make for the establishment of new schools?

Ans.—It will be obvious to the Committee, that by pursuing the system I have already described, the supply of school room would depend entirely upon the voluntary exertions of the various religious communities in the district. Taking the existing system as the basis, and providing for its extension at the will and by the efforts of the persons already charged with the management of the existing schools, if we said, ‘stop there,’ undertaking merely to pay the rates for the children in actual attendance at such schools, it might result that, as the population enlarged and extended, the supply of school-room might be found utterly inadequate, or inaccessible, for the reception of the children of the whole population. After much consideration, it was the opinion of the Committee with which I am connected, that it was impossible to propose a scheme for rating the whole property within the district for educational purposes, without at the same time undertaking positively to accomplish, and not merely to leave to contingency, those duties which we propose to fulfil. It became necessary, therefore, to introduce some provision, which should take effect in the absence of school room being provided by the different religious communities commensurate with the wants of the population.

855. The necessity for some kind of provision being urgent, we have adopted the only course which appeared open to us; and although we do not profess it to be in accordance with our wishes, we look upon it as a provision in a case of necessity required by the circumstances of the case, and one which, as I have before stated, we can, to some extent defend, if we are not prepared heartily to advocate it.

Accordingly the bill provides for the erection, under specified circumstances, of school buildings out of the rate. But here again the religious difficulty meets us. The education is to be religious; but under what modification? It was obviously the part of the promoters to fix upon a minimum quantity, as making the nearest approach to pleasing all parties; and we think they have gone a great way in this direction, in contenting themselves with the requirement that, in rate-built schools, provision shall

be made for the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures in the authorized version, (clause 86). Even this requirement, however gives rise to a mountain of difficulty. Thus the case opens.

859. *Chairman (to Mr. Entwisle).*—In the case of poor districts—take, for instance, the Irish district, where you have informed the Committee that the great bulk of the population are Roman Catholics—do you propose to have a religious test in those new schools that will exclude those Roman Catholics?

Ans.—I believe that such is the effect of the condition laid down in the bill?

860. What good will it do, therefore, for these Catholics, if you have a test that will exclude them from the schools?

Ans.—The provision for the rate-built schools undoubtedly, I am prepared to admit, will not operate for the benefit of the Roman Catholic population.

861. Will it positively exclude them?

Ans.—I believe, under the provision for the use of the scriptures in the authorized version, the Roman Catholic portion of the population would in effect exclude themselves.

862. Will you explain how a plan that excludes the very people whom it is proposed to provide for can be called a plan to make provision for those people?

Ans.—I can only describe what the provisions of the bill are.

Poor Mr. Entwisle!

866. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Entwisle).*—In the various discussions that must have taken place as to the difficulties in reconciling the contending religious views of the population of Manchester, how could you shut out from your contemplation the 80,000 persons professing the Roman Catholic faith?

Ans.—I have already stated, that, to the best of my recollection, the allegation contained in that declaration of the Roman Catholic clergy, dated on the 15th of March following our adoption of the principles of the bill. This was the first occasion on which the precise operation of that clause was brought before us, and it was the first time at which my own individual attention was called to it, and I was prepared to admit then, as I am now, that there is an apparent inequality in its operation. There is great difficulty in the case. When the attention of the Committee was called to it, considerable discussion took place, and it was their belief, as it is mine, that the exclusion of all provision, whether for the authorized version of the scriptures or for any other, would be equally objectionable to the Roman Catholics, as that stipulation which we have introduced. And I am entitled to say that it is my belief also that the introduction of a stipulation for the use of the Douay version would have been equally objectionable to those Roman Catholics who attended our Committee. Therefore I say, that, in introducing the stipulation which we have introduced, we have had no alternative which would satisfy those gentlemen. We had not one before us; and I am not aware, with regard to those rate-built schools, that at this moment there exists any means which would be entirely satisfactory to them, so far as to induce them to allow Roman Catholic scholars to attend those rate-built schools, unless conducted entirely on Roman Catholic principles.

867. *Mr. Monsell.*—What do you mean by “apparent inequality?” Do you distinguish that from a real inequality?

Ans.—It is real to some extent. But I think it is more apparent than real, because, in the support of their existing schools by the means furnished by the rate-payers at large, the Roman Catholics would unquestionably have it in their power to derive a larger share of benefit than any other part of the population; and I say that, if the rate-payers at large proffer their support on the simple condition of building their own school-room, I think substantially they have no just ground of complaint, and I therefore call it more an apparent than a real inequality.

874. *Chairman.*—Your plan, if I understand it rightly, is this. First of all you invite the Catholics to build schools for themselves, which you will support

by the ratepayers' money, and from which Protestants will be excluded ; and then, if they fail to do that, you say you will build Protestant schools, from which Roman Catholics are to be excluded. Is that your plan ?

Ans.—I think the Committee understand sufficiently what I have already endeavoured to bring before them, and I should prefer declining to answer a question worded as that question is.

Poor Mr. Entwisle !

After an extended examination, which effected nothing more than a repetition and amplification of what we have given above, we have the following.

888. *Mr. Cardwell (to Mr. Entwisle).*—Do not you feel that you are doing an injury to the cause of your bill in general, if you take for your battle-ground this clause in particular ?

Ans.—Yes ; but I am defending it to the best of my ability.

889. There being no probable necessity for these rate-built schools, if the bill were to pass the legislature without this clause in it, do you think there would be any serious objection felt to this eventuality by your Committee !

Ans.—No. I think it very likely that our Committee would not entertain any very serious objection to it ; . . . but I persist in my belief that the bill would have been open to more objection had it neglected to introduce such a provision as I have described, than it is now.

890. Having done your duty by prudentially putting in that clause, if the Committee struck it out it would not be unsatisfactory to you, and the gentlemen with whom you act ?

Ans.—I certainly do not think that our association would withdraw the bill.

Bravo, Mr. Entwisle ! There is nothing like a combination of courage and prudence. Having made a skilful demonstration, you know how to make an equally skilful retreat.

The Roman Catholics, it is proper to observe, are not the only parties injuriously affected by the religious test fixed for the rate-built schools, it bears also upon the Jews. At the time when the bill was drawn up schools of the Jewish persuasion were not admissible to grants from the parliamentary fund, but in the interval this has been remedied by a minute of the Committee of Council, which accepts the daily reading of the scriptures of the Old Testament. This, however, does not place them in any more favourable position in relation to the rate-built schools, (1107) in which, it seems, the New Testament also must be read. On this subject the following examination took place.

1109. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Entwisle).*—Is it not the fact, that, with regard to the Jews, it would be probably more inconvenient for them to build schools for themselves than for any other denomination, seeing that they are a smaller number, and are necessarily more dispersed over the whole surface of both towns, and consequently the hardship upon them would probably be greater than upon a more numerous body ?

Ans.—I am not sure that that is a necessary consequence. The honourable member will see, that it is only in cases where the wealthy part of the population are few in comparison with the poor that that peculiar difficulty would arise.

1110. The difficulty to which my question refers is as to the attendance of the children. If a schoolroom was built in any given portion of Manchester for the Jews, and but few schools for that body might be required, then the children, not living all together in that neighbourhood, would have to come from various parts of the town ?

Ans.—No doubt, the fact of being so scattered might necessitate their coming a longer distance than the children of other persuasions to attend school.

1111. And therefore, if they were excluded by any test from the rate-built schools, . . . the hardship to them would be proportionately greater ?

Ans.—I think that is so, perhaps ; but, if I admit that, I think it would be rather overstraining the hardship to them. It results from an accidental dispersion, rather than from any defect in the bill.

CHAPTER VI.

THE BILL VIOLATES LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE IN THE CHILD.

Again the religious difficulty appears, and in a more formidable shape than any in which we have hitherto encountered it. The bill directly and flagrantly violates liberty of conscience. We may introduce this very important subject as follows :—

1118. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Entwisle).*—You state that there are two modes in which it is pleaded that the rights of conscience may be invaded, and first, by forcing the children to have some kind of religion which their parents are not willing that they should learn ?

Ans.—Yes.

1119. Against that objection to a large extent you have provided.

Ans.—Yes, we think so.

Such is Mr. Entwisle's complacent answer ; but let us now see how this provision has been made.

686. *Mr. Monsell (to Mr. Entwisle).*—Would a child attending at any denominational school be compelled, as a condition of his getting the advantage of the secular education given in that school, to receive the peculiar religious instruction of the denomination to which the school belonged ?

Ans.—There is an express clause in the bill, which declares that any child shall be exempt from learning the creed, catechisms, or formularies, to which its parents, on a written notice, in a certain formal manner, shall object.

Such is the remedy provided by the bill for liberty of conscience on the part of the child. How imperfect it is, even if it were valid so far as it extends, appears by the next question which Mr. Entwisle had to answer.

687. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Entwisle).*—So that the pupils in these schools would be subject to learn the formularies as taught in the schools of the different sects, unless there came a written communication from the parent that he did not wish the child to learn those formularies ?

Ans.—Precisely so.

This, however, is not the most serious matter. An adversary by no means to be lightly esteemed rises up immediately.

688. *Chairman (to Mr. Entwisle).*—If it be considered by any particular religious body as a necessary part of their system that these catechisms and formularies should not be dispensed with, how do you reserve the right of conducting religious instruction as they think fit ?

Ans.—The hon. member is aware, probably, that that bears upon (I believe) only one class of the community, namely, schools in connexion with the National Society . . . My answer to that question is, that I conceive that the liberty of the managers of any school to communicate their religious opinions, as held by themselves, to their pupils generally, is not dispensed with or abrogated by allowing such a special exception in favour of a particular child, whose parents

may wish it to attend without the necessity of learning the catechisms. If the are at liberty to communicate their creed, catechisms, and formularies, to all the children of their own persuasion then in attendance on whose behalf no such written notice has been lodged, then we retain the principle of non-interference, and the communication of religious education founded on their own distinctive principles of faith, untouched. We do not believe it to be a necessary consequence, that the master of a school should endeavour to make instruction in the principles of his own faith a condition of the attendance of a child who does not belong to his own communion.

602. *Mr. W. Miles.*—Would not that interfere immediately with the charter of the National society?

Ans.—I believe not. I do not think that the charter of the National Society depends upon their enforcing that rule.

693. Does the charter hold this language—"to instruct the children of the poor in suitable learning, works of industry, and the principles of the Christian religion according to the established church"?

Ans.—Unquestionably, that was the intention of the formation of the National Society; their aid, consequently, is given to schools wherein they know that the catechism and formularies are adopted and taught; but I do not see that it necessarily follows, that where such formularies are generally taught to all the children who are willing to receive them, they should compel those who are not so willing to receive them as a condition of attendance. We think that, if support out of the rates paid by all is proffered to those schools, connected though they be with the National Society, they ought to receive all as long as they have room for them . . . and allow the child of a dissenter to attend school without the necessity of learning the catechism of the Church of England.

We think so too, but we know that upon this ground the battle still rages. Let the following part of Mr. Entwistle's examination bear witness to it:—

1041. *Marquis of Blandford (to Mr Entwistle).*—You stated, did you not, in a former part of your evidence, that it was a custom sometimes adopted by clergymen of the church of England, not to adhere too rigidly to the limitation contained in the rules of the National Society, namely, that all children shall be required to learn the catechism; and upon the occasional infringement of that rule you based a great deal of the principle upon which the 31st clause was introduced into the bill?

Ans.—Yes.

1042. And whether it be an infringement of the rules of the Society which is always noticed by the National society or not, still, it being a practice adopted occasionally by clergymen of the church of England, would not the introduction of this 31st clause into your bill render it always permissible, and would not that be a direct infringement of that rule of the National Society?

Ans.—It would render imperative in all cases of schools admitted to a share in the rate under this bill, that which is now the occasional practice in schools connected with the National Society.

1043. Do you apprehend that that being the case, the Church of England schools would be found generally to give in their concurrence to this measure?

Ans.—I am in great hopes they would. I cannot assert that to be the fact prior to experiment.

1044. Is it not a very serious matter to encroach upon a principle that has been well considered by the National Society, and by other bodies?

Ans.—I think, if the practice were insisted upon by the National Society which is not now insisted upon, if their conditions were enforced by the declaration that they would expect compliance with them in all cases where schools accepted aid from the Society, that would present a very formidable obstacle to the success of the further working of this bill.

And nothing is more likely, according to the present spirit of parties,

than the issuing of such a declaration. Even the Committee of Council have not solicited of the National Society the concession which a little knot of educationists at Manchester brusquely demand.

After all, however, this boasted provision for liberty of conscience is much more nominal than real, as the members of the Committee plainly saw, and as appears from the following evidence.

624. *Chairman to (Mr. Entwistle).*—Supposing a schoolmaster instructed the children in the scriptures according to the particular views of the denomination to which the school belonged, from that lecture or explanation of the scriptures by the school-master that child would not be permitted to absent himself?

Ans.—Certainly not.

695. It would be only the mere learning of the formula that he would be exempt from?

Ans.—Yes.

696. *Mr. Fox.*—Might not that very same creed be inculcated upon a child whose parents had protested against it, provided it were intermixed with other instruction?

Ans.—That is a necessary consequence of a child attending a school where religious doctrines are held and taught to which he does not conform.

Mr. Entwistle was further pressed upon this subject in a subsequent part of his examination, by a reference to his pamphlet, entitled “An Apology for a Churchman’s support of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill.”

1057. *Chairman (to Mr. Entwistle).*—You explain in this pamphlet, with regard to the effect of exempting persons from learning creeds, catechisms, and formularies, how far it is in the nature of a protection to conscience?

Ans.—I did attempt to do so.

1058. In that pamphlet you state, “I cannot admit that the exclusion of creeds, catechisms, and formularies, will exclude the teaching of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith; such as, for instance, the doctrines of a future life, of man’s fallen nature, of his religious responsibility, of the redemption of the world, and of the revelation of God’s will to mankind in the Holy Scriptures.” Are those your views?

Ans.—I wrote that passage, and of course, those are my views.

1059. In fact you do propose, that the schoolmasters in these schools should be permitted by the managers of the schools, as they think fit, to teach persons of all religious persuasions what you call ‘the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: such as, for instance, the doctrines of a future life, of man’s fallen nature, of his religious responsibility, of the redemption of the world, and of the revelation of God’s will to mankind’ in the pages of inspired Scripture?

Ans.—Unquestionably, by the terms of the bill I am desirous of reserving to the schoolmaster the right to teach in accordance with what I have laid down there.

1060. If the schoolmaster is to teach these things, how could the same schoolmaster teach Jews and Christians, Protestants and Catholics, Trinitarians and Unitarians?

Ans.—He would teach them all in accordance with the opinions which he himself held upon these subjects, otherwise he could not teach them at all.

1061. How can he teach one view upon these sacred subjects to which I have adverted to all those different classes of religionists?

Ans.—I presume in the same manner as any Church of England, or other Christian missionary, begins to teach a person who does not hold the opinions which he goes to teach.

1062. *Mr. Monsell.*—But a missionary goes to endeavour to convert people, does he not?

Ans.—They can only teach in the same manner. The distinction between the endeavour to convert and teaching as laid down in the bill I apprehend is this, that the missionary's zeal is fired with the intention of bringing it home to their doors; but in the case I have imagined, the scholar comes to the school, and is placed by his parents under the care of the master.

1063. But the idea of liberty of conscience in schools is that the children should be protected from conversion?

Ans.—They should be protected from being compelled to learn a confession of faith.

1065. *Marquis of Blandford.*—Then, with regard to the Unitarians, are there not essential doctrines connected with that particular creed, which it must be just as repugnant to a child to learn from a church of England teacher or a dissenting schoolmaster, as any that you could possibly imagine? For instance, in connection with that passage in your pamphlet, are there not doctrines generally held and professed by the Unitarians which are very repugnant and contrary to those laid down by you?

Ans.—If there be so, the result, I apprehend, would be, that any parent desiring such protection for his child against those doctrines would withhold him from such a school altogether.

1066. . . . It might be virtually compulsory for a child of that persuasion to attend that school, in consequence of there being no other school for him to go to where his own peculiar doctrines were taught?

Ans.—If that is the noble lord's opinion as to the result of the bill, all I can say is, that we do not attempt to protect him any further.

That is to say, there is no protection for conscience at all!

Upon this matter the Dean of Manchester expressed the same views as Mr. Entwisle.

1367. *Mr. W. Miles (to the Dean of Manchester).*—Was there a considerable discussion upon clause 31, as to formularies?

Ans.—There has been some discussion, in which I myself have taken a part; and I must candidly acknowledge that I consider the wording of that clause is not such as is calculated to give security, or afford satisfaction.

The Dean's principal objection is founded upon the prohibition of a "*religious creed*;" which, he says, "absolutely precludes any teacher from teaching any religious sentiment, there being none that cannot be called a '*religious creed*,' or a portion of a '*religious creed*,'" (1368). The Committee, however, felt an objection of another kind. So Mr. Bright, with his usual sagacity.

1376. *Mr. Bright (to the Dean of Manchester).*—On the other hand, if you left that word out,* and excluded only '*catechisms and formularies*,' would it not be open to any teacher thoroughly to indoctrinate the mind of a pupil with opinions entirely contrary to those held by the parents of that pupil?

Ans.—It is always in the power of any teacher to inculcate any system he thinks proper.

This was frank, Mr. Dean; but not more frank than just. We have often thought and said so, and are happy to have our opinion confirmed by such an authority. Let our readers ponder the question and answer which immediately followed.

1377. *Mr. Bright (to the Dean of Manchester).*—Then it would appear that the various guarantees you have attempted to provide in this bill would be generally without effect?

Ans.—I am certain that a school depends entirely on the character and competency of the teacher and master. Whatever words you may put into an

* Erroneously printed "*only*."

act, rely upon it that the school will imbibe the sentiments and views of the teacher of that school, whatever he may be. That has been the result of all my observations and experience hitherto.

And so an important question, it seems, is, or ought to be, settled. It has been a great object with the promoters of this measure to secure liberty of conscience, and to afford guarantees against sectarian teaching; but a high ecclesiastical authority announces that all will be "without effect," and that in fact there can be no such guarantee at all. As the Dean elsewhere pithily says, "the master makes the school." Be it henceforth understood, therefore, that the religious training of the children will correspond with the character of the school to which they go, and that of its teacher; and that parents who have any conscientious concern in this matter must look, not to the words of an act of parliament, but to the views and habits of the master to whom the objects of their solicitude are confided. We thank the Dean of Manchester for blowing away the cobwebs which have been elaborately spun around this question.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BILL VIOLATES LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE IN THE RATE-PAYER.

Having thus noticed the first of the two aspects in which religious liberty is violated by the local bill, let us now direct our attention to the second. We turn from the children to the rate-payers, by whose money taken by a process of law and put into a common purse, the whole motley group of religionists is to be remunerated for their endeavours to nourish or to poison, as the case may be, the rising generation. Mr. Bright opens the case.

1120. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Entwisle).*—The second point is the difficulty with regard to those who cannot consent that their money shall be taken, through the corporation or the government, to teach various religions which they may believe to be very erroneous?

Ans.—Yes.

And the concoctors of the local bill have elaborated for this hardship a remedy which, in the evidence, makes the following appearance.

895. *Mr. Monsell (to Mr. Entwisle).*—With regard to your statement as to the benefit that the Roman Catholic population would derive from the support of their schools, is there not a clause in the bill that any ratepayer may require his rate to be appropriated to a particular school?

Ans.—Yes; but it is immediately followed by a provision that prevents it from operating in such a manner as to deprive any school of the support that it would otherwise derive, in proportion to the number of its pupils, so that it is rendered almost nugatory by the provision that succeeds.

896. *Mr. Gladstone.*—Need you say 'almost?' May you not say altogether?

Ans.—The only reason why I did not say 'altogether' was because the clause was inserted at the representation of a member of the Society of Friends. He represented the objection which they entertained to what is commonly called a contribution for the propagation of error, and that clause, and the provision which follows it, were suggested as a means of overcoming his objection. . . It is not for me to say how, or why, the clause with its subsequent provision was satisfactory to the gentleman at whose instigation it was

prepared; but, though giving a temporary assent to the introduction of that clause and proviso, the body with which he is connected did subsequently publish a declaration of their objection against the whole bill on that very ground. A gentleman of the name of B—— was a member on our Committee, upon whose representations chiefly that clause and its subsequent proviso were framed.

897. He was satisfied with these clauses, was he?

Ans.—For the time; but subsequently, he, with other gentlemen, published a form of declaration, in which they objected to the whole bill on the ground that it sanctioned what is called the propagation of error. I am sorry that our association were ever induced to put upon the face of the bill a clause necessarily accompanied with a provision which renders its operation entirely nugatory.

898. You would be disposed perhaps to withdraw those clauses?

Ans.—I think so, unquestionably.

Such is the profound wisdom with which laws are devised in this enlightened and philanthropic age. After Mr. Entwisle's candid acknowledgment, we shall bid adieu to this clause and its proviso, citing merely the following remark of Mr. Baines.

The bill itself acknowledges the prevalence, if not the justice, of this objection, by the provision allowing ratepayers to appropriate their own payments to such class of schools as they think proper. It is now admitted that the provision would be altogether inoperative; and therefore the bill stands self-condemned, by recognizing a conscientious objection which it does nothing to remove, (1831).

No one got so deep into the mire on this part of the subject as the Very Rev. the Dean of Manchester, who, when pressed as a churchman with the difficulty of teaching such different religious systems out of a public fund, surprised the Committee by an answer to which we direct especial attention.

1409. *Chairman (to the Dean of Manchester).*—Many persons think that it is rather inconsistent with the principles of the established church, that the state should supply money for the teaching of other religions: do you concur in that opinion?

Ans.—They do not teach other religions, but they aid all to teach the same religion in the varied forms under which various classes of the community will receive it. The religion is the same, so far as the essential principles of Christian revelation are concerned, but the modes under which this religious sentiment is exhibited are not always the same, nor are they entitled to the same degree of attention—some may be more powerful and influential with some persons than others; but this bill does not interfere with the religious expression of any, but leaves them as it now finds them, giving such assistance as they may require, without interfering with the various forms of expression under which they choose to exhibit the religious sentiment.

We shall not soon forget the smile of incredulity and astonishment with which this answer was received. When it is recollected that this ecclesiastical dignitary was speaking of religious diversities no less remote from one another than Prelacy and Independency, than Evangelical orthodoxy and Socinianism, than Protestantism and Popery—Swedenborgianism and Mormonism might be added to these—to hear him say, "The religion is the same so far as the essential principles of Christian revelation are concerned," might fairly startle the most liberal, and some of a different class it might not unreasonably shock. We are far, however, from taking it as the Dean of Manchester's deliberate opinion. He was driven to

distress by the course of the argument; and not being willing to acknowledge an inconsistency, he made a concession which we are sure his sober judgment will not confirm. We must hold him, however, to this consequence of his words: either the religions we have named *are* "the same so far as the essential principles of Christian revelation are concerned," or it is an inconsistency that they should be taught out of a public fund.

There can be no doubt on which side of this alternative the great mass of Englishmen—and we may add, the great mass of English churchmen will range themselves. The prevailing and all but universal sentiment is, we cannot doubt, expressed in a paper put forth by the Society of Friends, and referred to in Mr. Baines's evidence, (1811). The language of this document is so pertinent to the present case, and so important as a counterpoise to that of the Dean of Manchester, that we shall quote it in terms.

"Can a conscientious protestant instruct, or directly remunerate a teacher to instruct, a child in the doctrine of purgatory, in the practice of prayer to saints, the invocation of the Virgin Mary, or bowing down to the Host! Or on the other hand, can a sincere believer in the Roman Catholic faith consent to pay for the propagation of those Protestant doctrines which his own spiritual advisers designate as heretical? One answer only is possible. They cannot. How then can they consent, under an act of parliament, to pay a rate for the instruction of children in those very doctrines and practices which, in their private capacities, they would conscientiously refuse to teach, either by their own lips or by means of a salaried substitute? But whatever view others may take, the Society of Friends *dare not* unite in practices so latitudinarian on matters of infinite importance."

This language, Mr. Entwisle and his friends may rest assured, expresses much more than Quaker scrupulosity; it will find an earnest response in too many enlightened and well principled minds to make their work easy.

All parties in Manchester, says Mr. Baines, concur in discarding the notion, that the municipal council is an abstraction for whose acts no one is responsible. They all agree in the view, that under the system of municipal self-government the ratepayers are morally responsible for the acts of their representatives, and for the use made of their money. Each of the two parties who propose rate-supported schools, found their objections to the plan of the other on this principle; they each protest against a measure which offends their own consciences; they both decline to be made participants in systems of which they conscientiously disapprove. The friends of the local plan revolt against a measure which excludes religion from the schools; the friends of the secular plan are outraged by a measure which would support religions they believe to be false. The voluntaries feel both plans to be false. All the three parties appeal to conscience, and all acknowledge responsibility for the acts of the town council, (1780).

Referring to this declaration of the Society of Friends, a member of the Committee brought out the following point.

1100.—*Mr. Bright (to Mr. Entwisle).*—Did they not argue, that a rate collected from everybody to teach everybody's religion to the young, was very much in its character the same as a church-rate, with this difference, that the church-rate was applied to teach one person's religion, and this rate would be applied to teach all?

Ans.—I believe their argument was of that nature.

1101. And they appeared to suppose, that the introduction of such a scheme into Manchester and Salford would lead to much of that dissension and heart-burning which had before existed when church-rates were imposed?

Ans.—I believe they did (most illogically, as I think) come to that conclusion;

because they certainly attempted to apply arguments deduced from a particular mode of support towards one religious system into an argument against support given generally to all alike.

1102. But amongst those who object to the church-rates there are two parties, the one objecting to the political injustice of the thing, and the other objecting on the ground of conscience; now so far as a man objects on the ground of conscience only, the objection would lie equally with regard to this scheme as to a church-rate?

Ans.—Yes, I think it would. That is a strict and fair conclusion.

This subject was resumed in the examination of Mr. Baines.

1832. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Baines).*—Have you any reason to believe, that, in some or many cases, the rates for schools under a system like that intended in the local bill would be felt very much like church-rates, and might be objected to much upon the same grounds that church-rates have been objected to in Manchester?

Ans.—I think they would.

1833. Are you aware that in Manchester there have been no legal church-rates collected for a great number of years?

Ans.—None have been collected in Manchester for many years. I believe that the payment of the school-rates would be very extensively refused; so extensively that they would be abandoned, as church-rates have been for the last 20 years.

Mr. Entwisle, however, does not absolutely give up his case, but takes refuge, in the *dernier resort*, in the plea of consistency. "I think," says he, that if the principle of objecting to the propagation of error "be adopted abstractedly, it ought to extend to putting an end to the present system of parliamentary grants," (1032). There is some force in this appeal. We do not see how it can be denied, that the grants of public money made by the Committee of Council to various bodies of religionists proceed on the same principle as would municipal grants to the same bodies out of a rate; and all we have to say is, that we claim a personal exemption from the bearing of this argument. We have always and totally disapproved of grants of public money for educational purposes. We watched their cautious, if not insidious commencement, and we have noted with but one feeling of deepening regret the steps by which they have reached their present character and amount. We have uniformly, and to the utmost of our power, resisted them, and with a clean breast we offer a resistance no less strenuous to an educational rate. We accept Mr. Entwisle's alternative when he adds—"I have only to say, that if that view be entertained by the Committee or by the public, it not only puts an end to this bill, but to any possibility of encouraging general religious education by public means," (1032). This sentiment is reiterated in the following terms:—

1116. I have already pointed out to the Committee what I conceive will be the inevitable result of insisting upon the principle of entire respect to the rights of conscience of the rate-payers, namely, that if no man is at liberty to contribute in any manner to the education of children connected with a religious persuasion from which he dissents, any public measure [for religious education] becomes impossible.

Mr. Richson, although he does not enter formally upon the religious difficulty, acts the part of a zealous and sagacious auxiliary by adducing an *argumentum ad hominem*. We do not refer to his statement (431) "that parliament has already sanctioned the principle of applying local rates to educational purposes so far as concerns the education of in-door pauper children;" a very sufficient answer to which is given by Mr. Baines,

when he says (1872) that, "in reference to pauper children, the state is *in loco parentis*." A much more clever thing than this is the following.

438. *Mr. Richson*.—I wish now to point out to the Committee the principle of the application of the poor-rate from which I derived originally the idea of parents sending their children to any school they may think proper, and (so to speak) the rate being taken wherever the parent chooses to send his child to school, and the schoolmaster being paid whatever the denomination of the school, provided it be in union.

It seems, that in Manchester (we use our own words for abridgment) poor persons "are assisted by the Guardians with a certain sum to inter their dead in any burial ground they please," and "the dues paid for interment go directly to the support of the ministers of religion."

It was from the practice here described, continues Mr. Richson, that I derived the idea of a child being sent by its parent to any school he thought proper, and the rate being applied accordingly; and I must confess that I have no sympathy with the persons who object upon conscientious grounds to the application of the poor-rate for educational purposes in the way we propose, so long as this practice with regard to interments is permitted to exist, (439).

This had the appearance of a fair hit, and the Committee were evidently considerably puzzled by it. One member asked whether the dues were paid directly to the clergyman, and another tried to draw a distinction between paying money for teaching and paying merely the necessary expenses of interring a dead body. The fact as stated by Mr. Richson, however, is only partially true. The guardians, no doubt, allow the money, and by the clergy of the Established Church it is received, being paid, as Mr. Richson states, to their deputy clerk; but the dissenting ministers (as we are assured by Mr. Hadfield) do not receive anything for burial fees from the poor-rate, and if Mr. Richson and his brethren would only imitate this commendable example, the anomalous practice he adduces would immediately be at an end.

After all, the very thing appears to exist in Manchester in a concrete form, which it is found impossible to agree upon in theory. It actually exists in the Ragged School, or, as it is called, by a felicitous and elegant euphemism, "the Juvenile Refuge." This valuable institution having been introduced to the notice of the Committee by Mr. Adshead, the following examination ensued.

2182. *Chairman (to Mr. Adshead)*.—I observe that you have upon your Committee gentlemen of various religious persuasions. Among others, I see one Catholic on the Committee of management. I see that the Bishop of Manchester is the patron, and that one of the canons, the Rev. Canon Clifton, is chairman of the Committee of management: is not that so?

Ans.—Yes.

2183. So that here is a combination of gentlemen of various religious persuasions, who have agreed upon a system of education which shall not interfere with the particular religious opinions of any body?

Ans.—Quite so.

Now Mr. Gibson has found a mare's nest. And he makes himself quite sure of it.

2187. They are all working together under a joint management, and they are all satisfied that there is no interference with freedom of conscience?

Ans.—Quite so.

2188. Therefore it is a system of mixed education in which persons of

various sects are combined together, without any interference with the scruples of any body ?

Ans.—Yes. I have considered that our Juvenile Refuge is in some degree an example in that respect, because I believe that in that school there is a fair amount of religious instruction imparted.

Several members of the Committee were anxious to investigate the process by which so remarkable and felicitous a result had been obtained, and a somewhat curious and not uninteresting examination followed, which, if our pages were not already overcrowded, we should gladly have extracted. The conclusion arrived at is, that in the Juvenile Refuge no religious instruction is imparted which is worth the having—that is to say, which leads a sinner to the knowledge of the Saviour ; and that the union of religious names in its management is based upon a tacit agreement to eschew all religious doctrines, and to attend to the secular well-being of the pupils. This became at length so obvious, that the following question and answer terminated the investigation.

2252. *Mr. Peto (to Mr. Adshead).*—You would not even consider the industrial school [another name for the Juvenile Refuge] to which you have referred one in which a religious basis formed part of its constitution ?

Ans.—I should like it to go further than it does, certainly.

2217. *Mr. W. Miles.*—You do not recommend that the same system of education should be current in all schools ?

Ans.—I would go further than that certainly in religious instruction.

How far, according to Mr. Adshead's description of it, it did go, may be known from the following question, put by a member of the Committee always ready to take an advantage fairly presented to him.

2213. *Mr. Fox (to Mr. Adshead).*—Do you apprehend that religious instruction as you have now been describing it would be at all objected to by the supporters of the secular system ?

Ans.—With regard to the secular system, so far as I understand it, they object to religious instruction altogether.

2214. Can you point to anything in their plans which at all precludes such instruction as you have now been describing under the name of religious instruction ?

Ans.—I am not aware that I can.

2215. *Chairman.*—They are not precluded from teaching moral precepts founded upon scripture history ?

Ans.—I believe they are not.

Enough ! The Manchester Juvenile Refuge affords no satisfactory example of religious instruction.

Being at another time examined as to the method and details of the “teaching of religion” in the Denominational schools, chiefly by some of the Seculars, and with a view to make him concede the practicability of separating it from the general instruction, Mr. Adshead adopted the following statement as expressive of his opinion.

2154. The modes of blending religious instruction, or rather culture, with daily education, are of two kinds, the direct and the indirect. 1. The direct methods of religious instruction are chiefly two : first the general reading of the holy Scriptures, with questions and brief explanatory remarks, or a daily Scriptures lesson. Second, the Bible class (a most important and invaluable method), in which, to select children, the more profitable portions of holy writ are more particularly gone into, with such doctrinal instruction and earnest practical exhortation as may be thought suitable. To each of these exercises perhaps half an hour may be deemed sufficient ; but it is plain that they cannot be put

together. They must be separated by a considerable interval. 2. The indirect methods of religious instruction, or culture, are also chiefly two. First, The more formal; as by commencing the school exercises with some act of devotion—for example, by prayer. Second, The more familiar, consisting of the constant exercise of a religious watchfulness, the habitual application of religious motives, and the frequent administration of religious counsel; the whole confirmed and enforced by the influence of a Christian temper and example on the part of the teacher himself. To such religious culture the question of time is wholly inapplicable. It should evidently be going on always.

Nothing can be more clear, we think, than that in such a process none can work harmoniously together but friends of the bible, and of its leading doctrines. With respect to those who hold these, however, there is nothing to prevent co-operation. It was justly remarked by Mr. Baines—

1864. There are many sects that might unite. What are generally called the Evangelical Protestant sects would have no difficulty in uniting, and could do so in religious efforts—as they do, for example, in town and city missions, and in several other objects.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BILL MAKES CAPRICIOUS USE OF THE MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL.

Our readers are probably aware of the very clever use which the advocates of the local scheme have made of the minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education. Finding it very hard to determine what schools should be acknowledged as religious, they agreed to accept as such all that did or might receive grants from that body; restricting their acquiescence, however, to such minutes as should have been adopted prior to the passing of their bill. The sagacity of these gentlemen was duly appreciated by the Committee.

1114. *Mr Bright (to Mr Entwisle).*—It appears that your association, in the midst of their difficulties in attempting to do what is very meritorious, have made use of the Privy Council and its minutes as a mode of escape from some of these difficulties?

Ans.—Yes.

1113. *Mr Ker Seymer.*—You do not make any provision in your proposed bill, for the admissibility hereafter of schools under fresh regulations of the Committee of Council?

Ans.—No.

774. *Chairman.*—Is what the Committee are to understand from you this, that your Committee have considered the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council, and have come to the conclusion to take their stand upon the existing Minutes, and that to have gone further would not have been agreeable to the Committee in many respects, and that they take their stand upon these Minutes advisedly?

Ans.—They take their stand upon these Minutes advisedly, as drawing a line for them which they could not draw for themselves in the terms of an act of parliament.

749. Have you considered it wise to take your stand upon the Minutes of Council as they now exist, when, from year to year, fresh Minutes are brought

out, and changes are made, both in the rules of inspection, and also in the sort of schools that are entitled to Parliamentary grants ?

Ans.—I consider it very wise to take our stand upon the existing Minutes. They are the only Minutes that our Committee will accept ; they will not lend [bind] themselves to any terms that the Committee of Council may hereafter direct.

750. *Mr. Cardwell.*—When you say “the only terms that they will accept,” I presume you mean there must be something definite, which is to be the basis of concurrence among a number of people ; and when you speak of regulations to be made hereafter, they cannot be made definite, and therefore cannot form the basis of concurrence ?

Ans.—Precisely. I mean to say, that our Committee, composed of members of many different religious persuasions, are willing to adopt and ratify that which they see before them and know, but they will not hand over their opinions into the keeping of the Committee of Privy Council.

776. *Mr. Bright.*—Is it not the fact that, with regard to this difficult point, there are many persons in your Committee connected with the introduction of this bill who would be quite content to embrace a wider range, and not to restrict yourselves by the existing Minutes of the Privy Council ?

Ans.—I have not heard any such opinion expressed ; I have heard the contrary expressed very distinctly.

It is a somewhat curious phenomenon, this, of the eager acceptance of all that the Committee of Council have done, and the insuperable dread of all that they may hereafter do. The latter, however, is wise, whatever may be said of the former. Nothing could be more perilous than to affirm beforehand, that whatever Minute the Committee of Council may hereafter make shall have the force of an Act of Parliament ; and next to this folly, in our judgment, is that of giving the force of an act of parliament to all the Minutes they have hitherto passed. Mr. Entwisle acknowledges (774) that the Minutes are drawn up in terms in which an act of parliament could not be expressed, and that the Committee of Council, in putting them into force, “have a discretionary power” which enables them to interpret their own Minutes for themselves,” and to set at defiance those “legal eyes” which might too closely “scrutinize” the phraseology of the law of the land.

CHAPTER IX.

NUMBER AND WEIGHT OF OBJECTING PARTIES.

After all, the many and weighty objections to the local scheme might be less thought of, if there existed a sufficient agreement among parties to allow of its practical working. Not only is this far from being the case, however, there is no approach to it. If the bill were passed into a law, its execution would to a certainty be encountered by so many obstructions as to reduce it ultimately to a dead letter.

An important portion of the evidence presented by Mr. Baines and Mr. Adshead consists in a statement of the objections which have been taken to the bill by various, and in some respects opposite parties. Of these objections we can give only a summary recapitulation here, referring such of our readers as wish to see them more in detail to the evidence itself.

First and foremost in this hostile array is that very important body (in this matter at least) the corporation of Manchester, who, after a long and animated discussion, passed a resolution adverse to the bill by 34 to 22, and subsequently adopted a petition to Parliament of a similar tenor. In connexion with this discussion, Mr. Adshead, who is a member of the town council, presented to that body ten memorials from Independent and Baptist congregations; Mr. Alderman Bancroft, one from the Society of Friends; and Mr. Alderman Pilling, one from the Manchester House-owner's Guardian Society, (2441).

Next to the corporation of Manchester may perhaps be ranked the bishop, who, though at first favourable to the bill, has publicly declared his disapprobation of one of its most important parts—namely, that relating to the religious instruction to be given in the rate-built schools; has uttered sentiments inconsistent with the views of the promoters as to the treatment of the children of Dissenters (1088); and has advanced claims to an authority over the rate-built schools incompatible with the objects of the bill (1783).

In immediate contiguity to the bishop must be placed the twenty clergymen of Manchester, (1784) said to have the spiritual care of 170,000 of its inhabitants, who petitioned against the bill. Now shall follow, with due deference, the Dissenting Ministers and their congregations on whose behalf petitions against the bill were presented to Parliament; that of the ministers with 35 signatures, and that of the people with 4,548 (1789). To these are to be added a declaration against the bill signed by 335 male teachers connected with 15 Sunday schools in the Manchester Sunday-school Union, confided to Mr. Adshead for presentation to the Committee (2442). The Roman Catholic clergy of Manchester and Salford have formally objected to the bill (1810), and so have the Society of Friends (1811). The Congregationalists, at a Public Meeting in Manchester in 1851 (1818); the Baptist Union at its Annual Session in 1852 (2448); and the Voluntary School Association, at a Conference and public meeting held in Manchester in February, 1852 (1818); have all passed resolutions condemnatory of the bill.

To these must be added, the National School Society, whose charter is invaded by the bill, and will certainly be very warmly defended; and last, but not least, the National Public Schools Association, whose scheme is the immediate rival of the bill for public favour, and which obtained from Manchester, and presented to parliament, a petition against it signed by 60,000 persons.

Let our readers connect with this amount of hostility the following question and answer.

1819. *Chairman [Mr. Bright] (to Mr. Baines).*—Is it your opinion that those various objections and objectors are sufficiently numerous and sufficiently important to present an almost insuperable obstacle to the adoption of this measure?

Ans.—I think so. And I would request the serious attention of the Committee to the great number and importance of these objecting bodies, to the serious and insurmountable nature of their objections, to the extensive injustice that must be done if the bill should be passed in defiance of such objections, to the probability that it would be found quite impossible to work it from a combination of the town-council and the rate-payers against it, and to the certainty that it must cause never-ending contention.

CONCLUSION.

We have occupied our readers' attention too long (if readers we have had) by the preceding pages, to be willing to detain them an unnecessary moment. Let them allow us only a word or two.

Of the course over which we have gone the following is a summary view. The local scheme is primarily eleemosynary, that is, charitable. Its advocates allege an educational deficiency; but they have, as to school accommodation avowedly no case, and as to school attendance really none. They allege a widely operating poverty; but the poverty alleged does not exist, nor, if it did exist, does the local scheme supply a remedy for it. Null as a charity, it is pleaded for on the secondary grounds—that school support is inadequate; that a school rate is on a par with other rates; that education will diminish the cost of pauperism and crime; and that society has a right to see to its own interest; all which pleas we have examined, and refuted. The petitions also we have weighed, and found wanting.

Concerning the local bill we have come to the following judgment; that it is superfluous, costly, unjust, uncharitable, and injurious; that it is destructive to educational efforts on the voluntary system; that it entails government control; that it creates a religious endowment; that it provides unsatisfactorily for new schools; that it violates liberty of conscience, both in the child and in the rate-payer; that it makes capricious use of the minutes of the Committee of Council; and that it is objected to by parties too numerous and influential to allow of its being carried into operation.

Our closing remarks shall be directed to two questions—first, whether a case has been made out for legislative interference; and if not, what measures are best adapted to supply to the process of popular education its proper and desirable stimulus.

With respect to the first of these points we may begin by observing, that we do not think the advocates of the Local scheme have made out anything like the case they expected, or produced anything like the impression on which they calculated. We attended the examination from the first, and speak consequently from personal knowledge and observation. Before the Committee assembled it was whispered in the corridor that the Voluntaries had no idea of the fearful nature of the case which would be made out, and we entered the apartment "with bated breath," and an almost trembling expectancy of what we were to hear; as the examination proceeded, however, our spirits revived, and we gradually grew quite comfortable. After some time we whispered, "Is this all?" But at length it went round our circle, with a look of pleased surprise, "Mr. Richson is making out a case for the Voluntaries!"

We have reason to believe that an impression of a similar kind, although perhaps less strong, was made upon the members of the Committee at large. We know that some of the most strenuous advocates for parliamentary interference among them distinctly admitted that the case of the voluntaries had improved as the evidence advanced; and we are much mistaken if there was not produced a general conviction, that too much good was doing and likely to be done upon the voluntary system to allow to any considerable interference with it the character of wisdom.

With respect to the Local scheme in particular, we think it made small progress in the estimation of the Committee. It had evidently some warm friends, among whom Mr. Cardwell made himself conspicuous—he may be called, indeed, a partizan; Mr. Gladstone and the Marquis of Blandford, though evidently inclined to the same side, exhibited more impartiality and openness to information, a commendation in which we are sorry to say we cannot include Mr. Monsell or Mr. Brotherton. Lord J. Russell did not often attend the meetings of the Committee, nor did he pay any great attention to its proceedings when he was there; the few questions which he asked showed him to be entrenched in a set of previously formed notions, which he had no intention to relinquish. The position of the Chairman, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Bright, as advocates of the secular system, is well known, and it is enough to say of them that they acted their part with great skill and good humour. Mr. W. Miles, who attended, as it was understood, on the part of the government, apparently committed himself to no side, but endeavoured with much impartiality, discrimination, and candour, to get at the truth and measure of every statement. Of staunch voluntaries the only one in the Committee was Mr. Peto, of whose attention to the business in hand, and courtesy to those more particularly interested in it, we have to speak in high and cordial terms.

The evidence taken by the Committee assumed a somewhat singular character, in consequence of the antagonism of the parties by whom it was given. First, a large mass of facts and calculations was presented by Mr. Richson; these were examined by Mr. Baines and Mr. Adshead; Mr. Richson asked to be heard in reply, and contrary to a resolution of the Committee, and we must say to the propriety of the case, extended his reply over the whole field of inquiry. The result is that the evidence is of an unusually dodging character. One statement settles nothing; nor do even two settle anything; you have always to look for a third, and from the three to collect what has been proved, or may be believed. It is, however, a counterbalancing advantage to the tiresomeness thus attaching to the examination of the evidence, that the subject must have received a more thorough examination. The Locals, at least, have no cause to complain.

Our general view of the case put forward by the Locals may be expressed in the words of Mr. Baines.

1578. I submit to the Committee, that those facts and opinions which I have quoted from the tables, and calculations, and evidence of the promoters of the bill, are absolutely fatal to its claims on the support of the Committee; that they prove, with overpowering strength, the ability and willingness of the people of Manchester to build and sustain schools of every kind, wherever and to whatever extent they may be required; that the plea of inability on the part of the working classes to pay for the education of their children is refuted, not only by the high rate of wages in Manchester, but by the fact, that, in the poorest districts, and among the poorest classes, the children are now as generally sent to school and paid for as in the less poor districts; and that the alleged difficulty of obtaining subscriptions for the annual support of schools, whatever individual cases may be adduced, is proved to be of no force whatever, by the splendid liberality exhibited during a long course of years, and with continual enlargement, on behalf of education among all classes.

We are quite aware, however, that a successful opposition to the demand for further legislative interference with popular education, if it have already been or shall hereafter be effected, is a totally different thing from placing popular education in a satisfactory position; and we proceed therefore to

our second question, What are the measures best adapted to supply to this process the proper and desirable stimulus?

Far are we from maintaining with Mr. Alderman Bancroft, in his speech before the Manchester Town Council, and as quoted by Mr. Adshead in his evidence (2277), that "we are progressing in education as rapidly as is safe"—we forgive Mr. Fox and Mr. Brotherton the significant smile which they exchanged with one another when this statement was made—or with Mr. Adshead himself, that the rate at which popular education is at present advancing is as rapid as can be desired. Our mind on this point was better expressed by Mr. Baines, in answer to the following question.

1697. *Mr. W. Miles (to Mr. Baines).*—Although it [the voluntary system] has raised the number of scholars in the proportion you have stated, do you think that it now affords that ample education which is necessary?

Ans.—I do not think that the state of education in this country at this time has attained to anything like what it ought to be.

1524. At what age would you stop?

Ans.—I would not stop anywhere; I would go on as long as I could. I wish to be continually extending the period, and I would always be urging the parents to send their children for a longer period to school.

Indeed, we think, the single fact that the growth of the population of Manchester has been for the last 17 years outrunning the progress of education, demonstrates the necessity of further and more vigorous exertion. The real and practical question is, what and what kind of thing is it best to do?

On this point there was evidently a misconception existing in the minds of the Committee, and not of the Committee only, for Mr. Richson himself repeatedly evinced it, to the effect that the thing to be done was "to provide the means of education." Now this is an utter mistake. "The means of education," that is to say, schools and schoolmasters, are already, not only abundant, but redundant in Manchester, as all evidence shows; the thing required is to induce the attendance of the children, this and nothing more. Now we submit that this is not a question of money at all, but of influence; and that, as a question of influence, it lies within a small compass, since the influence to be employed must be of one of two kinds, persuasion or compulsion. If it is to be the latter, of course we must have the interposition of parliament; but this, although some of the School Inspectors have demanded it, and some men of the Manchester movement have distinctly called for it, has found no favour in the Committee. Mr. Richson, indeed, has deprecated it in the strongest terms. If, then, we are to employ persuasion, it is plain that we want no act of parliament. We want in this case some development of voluntary energy; we should have said some *new* development of it, but that we recollect that some exertions of the class we indicate have been already made. We refer to the Manchester Town Mission.

A full and interesting account of this admirable Christian institution is given by Mr. Adshead in his evidence, 2065; but we must confine ourselves here to what is strictly to our purpose, namely, that it is one of the objects of the agents employed to induce parents to send their children to school. It was stated that in the last 15 years, from 1837 to 1852, no less than 6,285 children had been induced to attend the Sunday schools, but that no return had been made of those induced to attend day-schools. Here is evidently a machinery eminently adapted to the purpose in view,

and one capable of an application as enlarged and extended as the object may demand. Not only may persuasives be thus addressed to the unwilling, but assistance may be tendered to the destitute, as at present, according to Mr. Baines (1867), "in some cases the missionary receives money from benevolent individuals, with which to pay for the schooling of those children whose parents he may believe are not able to bring them to school." If this is not already, "so general (according to a question by Mr. W. Miles, 1868), as to lead to the belief that there are very few poor children in the district that cannot be provided with education," there is no reason at all why it should not become so, and it would be in all respects better than meeting even this part of the case by a rate.

What we have now before us is clearly the sort of agency that is wanted, and it will be well worth while for the conductors of the Manchester Town Mission to see what can be effected in the educational department by the 72 agents they employ. There is no reason, however, why there should not be very much spontaneous activity added to this. There is an immense amount of social influence brought into play for relieving the sorrows and adding to the comforts of the working classes; and we feel confident, that, if the thousands of kind and liberal visitors of their poorer neighbours would make this one of the objects to which they direct their attention, an infinite amount of benefit would result. Is it not strange that some such system as this has not been tried, before the raising of this vehement cry and imperious demand for a school rate?

Such a plan would be powerfully recommended by its congruity with the great principle on which benevolent objects are generally promoted among us. "Is it not a fact," said Mr. Bright to Mr. Adshead (2503), "that the voluntary system, the same system which is pursued now in providing education, is that which is pursued in all sects in the extension of religious instruction and religious influences?" Assuredly it is.

2507. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Adshead).*—Does your observation lead you to believe, that efforts of that nature upon the voluntary principle are greatly extending, not only amongst the dissenting bodies, but also amongst those connected with the Established Church?

Ans.—Certainly so.

2508. Of late years?

Ans.—Yes: . . . and I venture to think that it is dangerous to interfere with the principle.

We think so too. It will be far wiser to encourage it, and, by a spirit of general co-operation, to promote the attainment of those grand results of which its partial development has given so rich a promise.

APPENDIX.

No. 1.—HULME'S CHARITY.

Among the papers in the Appendix, is one under the above title (No. 5), of the contents of which, illustrated by the evidence of Mr. Kay (2408 *et seq.*), it is proper we should give a brief account.

It appears, then, that in the year 1691, Mr. William Hulme bequeathed the residue of his "inheritable lands and hereditaments" to certain trustees, "to the intent and purpose" that the clear rental should be annually distributed among "such four of the poor sort of bachelors of arts at Brazen-nose College, in Oxford, as from time to time shall resolve to continue and reside there by the space of four years after such degree taken;" "my mind and will being," continues Mr. Hulme, "that no such bachelors shall continue to have anything of this my exhibition but only for the space of four years, to be accounted from the time of such degree taken." Four exhibitioners were duly appointed from 1692 to 1770, the exhibition commencing at £10 a year, and gradually increasing to £60. The increasing value of the property, however, has led the trustees to apply repeatedly to Parliament for fresh powers. In 1770 they obtained an act to increase the number of exhibitioners to 10; and in 1795, one to increase the number of exhibitioners to 15, and the allowance to £110 per annum.

In 1814 the trustees obtained their third act, by which they were empowered to increase the stipends, if they should think fit, to an amount not exceeding £220 per annum, and also to purchase or build convenient rooms or lodgings for their residence—but this latter object has never been effected, because (as I understand) no site can be procured near to Brazen-nose College, and accessible thereto by the common gate—at a cost of £5000, the sum limited for that purpose. This act introduced several important alterations of the founder's disposition. It empowered the nominators to appoint undergraduates of Brazen-nose College who should have entered on the 13th term from their matriculation; and it authorized the trustees, by any order at a general meeting, to dispense with residence at college at any time not in full term, as the trustees should think advisable, (2411).

This act also authorized the trustees "to pay to a lecturer in divinity, to be annually nominated by the principal of Brazen-nose College, an annual sum not exceeding £150.

In 1827 the trustees of this growing charity obtained a fourth act, in which they state "that the benevolent and pious objects of the testator would be best advanced by applying the accumulations of the trust monies in the purchase of livings, and by presenting thereto Hulme's exhibitioners; they were therefore empowered to purchase livings, not expending more than £7000 in any one purchase, and not reducing the accumulations below £20,000. They were also empowered to expend any sum not exceeding in any one case £700 in erecting parsonage houses," (2411).

In 1839 the trustees obtained yet a fifth act. In this act they state, that the laudable objects of the founder would be further advanced by

applying part of the accumulations of the charity funds in erecting parsonage houses, and in building and endowing churches; and they were accordingly empowered to lay out their accumulations (not reducing the fund below £5,000) in the endowment of advowsons bought by them, in building and endowing churches or chapels, and in providing a fund for repairs, (2411).

Such in brief is the history of this charity, and it is to us highly curious and instructive. We see, for example, how an educational endowment having originally no ecclesiastical character slides gradually and inevitably, as down an inclined plane, into the capacious and ever open maw of the church. "I do not find anything in the will," says Mr. Kay (2422), "that expressly directs that [the exhibitors] shall be brought up for the ministry. It does not appear to be so. In fact, a large proportion of them are not brought up as clergymen. A large proportion of them, after taking the degree of bachelor of arts, do not proceed any further." Yet the bulk of this wealthy charity, which is now worth £5000 a year, and will, on the near expiration of leases on house property in Manchester, be worth double that sum, is spent in the purchase of livings, and in the building and endowment of churches and chapels! And this under pretext of carrying out "the laudable object of the founder!"

We see also how what was primarily intended for the poor comes, by a like sort of necessity, to be regarded as the patrimony of the rich. Mr. Kay makes the following statement.

2415. Upon looking at the names of the 15 exhibitors, I find all of them, with the exception of two, have three names, and many of them four. My inference from that statement is this, that the exhibitions are now sufficiently valuable to induce inquiry after them on the part of those who have influence and connexions to obtain them; and that, in point of fact, very few of the exhibitors can be called "of the poor sort," such as the testator contemplated when the devise in question was made.

So tortuous is the stream of testamentary charity! Nor is this all; for Mr. Kay adds—

2428. The testator expressly declared by his will, that his mind and will is 'that no such bachelor shall continue to have anything of this my exhibition but only for the space of four years, to be accounted from the time of such degree taken;' whereas the trustees now have laid out their surplus money in purchasing livings, to give the benefit of the trust to persons for their entire lives.

That all this has been done under the sanction of Parliament is true, and consequently there is no charge of malversation against the trustees; but what Parliament has done Parliament can undo, and we think the question whether this large charity would not be disposed of more nearly in accordance with the views of the founder if it were made available in aid of general education, is highly worthy of being entertained by them. We entirely concur in the following suggestion of Mr. Kay.

2411. I trust the Committee may deem it proper to recommend, that a portion of the surplus annual income of this charity should be applied to educational purposes within the parish of Manchester, and that the steps requisite to obtain the sanction of Parliament to that object be adopted as early as practicable.

2418. *Mr. Bright (to Mr. Kay).*—Do you wish to suggest to the Committee that any alteration should be made, in order to make these funds more extensively available for the purposes contemplated by the testator?

Ans. In a recent report of the Oxford University Commission, the practice

of buying livings, I believe, is observed upon, and recommended not to be continued by the different colleges. Assuming, therefore, that that view is a correct one, if the trustees were to adopt it, and to restore this large fund to its original destination by selling those livings as they fall off again, it is obvious that a very large sum would be raised immediately, in the county of Lancaster, for educational purposes, and that the amount, applied either as capital or income, would be available to a very great extent for the purposes of education.

We commend this suggestion to the consideration of the trustees.

No. 2.—COMMON SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Among the materials supplied to the Committee in relation to education in the United States, were some documents furnished by Edward Twisleton, Esq., who, however, was not examined by the Committee, but, being “on the eve of leaving England for two or three months,” was allowed to present them through the Chairman. They relate to the New England system of free-schools, particularly as developed in Massachusetts; a system of which Mr. Twisleton has some personal knowledge, and expresses a high opinion. Wishing, however, to present to the public opinions more influential than his own, he, in the autumn of 1851, and being then in New England, addressed an interrogatory circular to a number of distinguished men, and examined orally Dr. Barnas Sears, Secretary to the Massachusetts Board of Education; and he now favours us with their replies.

This paper (Appendix No. 6) is of great pretension, since the witnesses called upon to give evidence are all of them eminent for character and station. We should not do justice to Mr. Twisleton, perhaps, if we were to withhold their names; but we are not afraid of them. They are as follows :—

1. Hon. Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, and late Senator in Congress from Massachusetts.
2. Hon. William Everett, late American Minister in England.
3. Hon. George Bancroft, late American Minister in England.
4. The Right Rev. Dr. Eastburn, Protestant Bishop of Massachusetts.
5. Hon. William Appleton, Representative of Massachusetts in Congress.
6. Hon. Robert Winthrop, late Representative of Massachusetts in Congress.
7. Hon. F. C. Gray, late Senator of Massachusetts, and author of a work on prison discipline.
8. Hon. George Hillard, late Senator of Massachusetts.
9. William H. Prescott, Esq., the Historian.
10. George Ticknor, Esq., Author of ‘History of Spanish Literature.’
11. Henry W. Longfellow, the Poet.

These are unquestionably great names; but *major veritas*. Mr. Twisleton has examined them, and we will cross-examine them.

We shall best enter on the subject which thus comes before us by making a few extracts from the examination of Dr. Sears.

Q.—Will you be so good as to explain the precise form and extent of the religious instruction which is given in the common schools?

A.—A great diversity exists in regard to the form in which religious instruction is given in the schools. Religion is not taught as a matter of theology,

according to the forms of the Catechism ; but is generally inculcated as a matter of devotion and Christian morals. The scriptures are almost universally used in some way in the public schools.

Q.—Is there any difference of opinion prevalent as to the extent to which the bible should be used as a text-book in schools ?

A.—There is. Very many persons of deeply religious sentiments are of opinion that it is more favourable to the religious character of the young that the scriptures be used for devotional purposes, instead of as a text-book.

Q.—When the bible is used for devotional purposes, what is the precise manner in which it is so used ?

A.—Select portions are read, sometimes by the teacher, sometimes by a pupil selected by the principal for the purpose, and sometimes by all the members of the school who are able to read fluently.

Q.—Is the bible read at the commencement of the school ?

A.—Usually at the opening of the morning session. In some schools the morning exercises begin with the reading of select portions of scripture, the singing of school hymns, and a brief prayer (extemporaneous or written), or sometimes a psalm, or the Lord's prayer. This, with a few practical remarks, sometimes constitutes the whole of the religious exercise, but it is left optional with the teacher.

Q.—Upon whom does the selection of prayers, psalms, and hymns depend ?

A.—Upon the teacher. The Committee leave entirely to the teacher the precise manner in which he would perform the devotional exercises of the day. They do not prescribe the precise mode of teaching and discipline.

To these statements let us add some cognate ones derived from the answers to the Circular Queries. The fourth query is this :—“ In your opinion is the system of instruction pursued in the common schools of New England indirectly favourable to the cultivation of the religious sentiments, and to the promotion of morality ?” To this the Hon. Robt. Winthrop replies in the affirmative, stating in the latter part of his answer as follows :—

It is among the positive duties which our law imposes on all instructors and teachers, ‘to exert their best endeavours to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction the principles of piety and justice, and a sacred regard to truth ;’ and the pupils of our normal schools, who are afterwards to become the teachers of our common schools, are expressly required to be educated ‘in the principles of piety and morality common to all sects of Christians.’

The same question is thus answered in the affirmative by the Hon. F. C. Gray :—

It is so by affording special securities that the teachers shall be exemplary as moral and religious men. Speaking of the watchfulness of the school Committees, he adds, No one can be a teacher here who does not, under this close scrutiny, maintain an unimpeachable character for morals and piety ; for no parents, whatever they may be themselves, would let any other instruct their children.

Thus in the outset we are clearly led to the conclusion that the common schools of Massachusetts are, in theory at least, not secular, but distinctly religious schools. We cannot well understand how Mr. Twisleton should have assumed the contrary, and framed his fourth query after so singular a manner. Still less can we understand the reason why Mr. Ticknor should favour us with a disquisition “ on the separation of doctrinal teaching in religion from the teaching of the common schools.” “ I will say a single word,” says this gentleman, “ on the New England system, regarded as one that separates all teaching in the free schools from all teaching of

religious doctrines." How can this be? What are "the principles of piety" but "religious doctrines?" And what are "the principles of piety common to all sorts of Christians," but the doctrines of Christianity? There must be some strange confusion of thought here, or, what may be as mischievous, confusion of terms. We really ought to know what this "doctrinal teaching," of which we hear so much among educationists on both sides of the Atlantic, is. It is as hard to catch as the sea-serpent.

Now that we recollect ourselves, however, we believe that there is another circumstance to be taken into the account. Of late years a great practical change has been silently introduced into the common school system, and without any change of the law requiring them to be religious, they have been converted in fact into secular schools. Thus Mr. Baines.

1928. There is something exceedingly peculiar in those schools, as they profess to be what they are not. They pretend to be, as they were originally, schools for teaching religion, and yet the teaching of religion is almost altogether banished from them. It is distinctly stated by the Hon. Horace Mann, in his 10th report of the schools of Massachusetts. He says, "The policy of the State promotes, not only secular, but religious instruction; yet in such a way as leaves to every individual the right of private judgment, and the sacred freedom of conscience." In the origin of those schools in Massachusetts, which was 210 years ago, namely, in 1642, the instruction enjoined by law was distinctively religious instruction, and so it continued for a great number of years—that was the origin of the school system of New England in the Puritan times, by those called the pilgrim fathers; but at present, whilst it is nominally religious, I apprehend that there is almost no religious instruction given in the day schools of the United States at all.

This explains everything; and might be very satisfactory did it not leave upon the statements we have cited above a character of great disingenuousness. They are clearly intended to convey an impression of what the system *now is*, when (and it can scarcely be so without their knowledge of the fact) it is no such thing. There is, however, but one alternative. The gentlemen who make these statements are either too disingenuous or too ill-informed to be trustworthy witnesses.

A second observation which we find occasion to make on the statements presented to us by Mr. Twisleton is this, that the principal reason which commends the common school system to the gentlemen whose opinion he has asked is of a political nature. We shall make this observation good by a citation of extracts.

Thus speaks Mr. Webster :—

The great merit of the system is that it is a public provision for the education of *all* the children. The schools are so good that the children of the wealthy are sent to them from choice. Hence there is nothing eleemosynary in their character. All classes mingle together in the school room. This would be good, I think, in any country; in ours it is an essential part of our social system.

Mr. Winthrop uses similar language :—

I cannot conceive of our getting along without them [the common schools] under a political system like ours. They are a part of our 'government; they are our most efficient police; our institutions would not enable us to provide any substitute for them.

In the same manner Mr. Gray :—

I do approve of it, and for these reasons among others: because it is highly

important for the security of society in all free countries, and most in the freest, that the children of all sects, classes, and conditions, since they must mingle together subsequently in the conflicts of life, should from their earliest years be intimately associated in similar pursuits (as they are in school) on terms of perfect equality.

The same sentiment is expressed by Mr. Hillard :—

Our system of public schools is the natural growth of our soil, and the necessary complement of our system of self-government. I cannot conceive of the permanence of our institutions without a system of popular instruction. . . . In democratic communities there is always a sense of heart-burning likely to be engendered from an observation of the inequality of fortune and condition among men. The remedy to this state of feeling is to be sought in the cultivation of a genuine sympathy on the part of the more favoured towards the less favoured classes ; and nothing will more tend to produce this sympathy than that the children of each should attend the same schools.

Mr. Prescott says the same thing :—

Such an 'education is of the last importance to a republican government like ours. I believe this New England system to be more effectual than any system of teaching has yet been made elsewhere to ensure the well-being of a state.

By these citations we think we have abundantly justified our observation, that, to the parties whose opinion is now before us, the principal recommendation of the Massachusetts' school system is its political character and influence. Mr. Baines takes the same view.

1938. One considerable reason which appears in the reports of the superintendents of several of the schools for supporting those common schools, is that they are decidedly favourable, as they conceive, to their republican institutions, and to the republican spirit of equality. They are strongly prejudiced against private schools, which they speak of sneeringly as places for nourishing an aristocratic feeling, and they wish upon distinct political, and distinct republican grounds, to maintain schools in which all classes are educated together. And this is also not merely by them, but in the general reports, characterised as the great support of the distinctive republican institutions of the United States, and on that ground they are held to be of great value.

Now we wish to ask our Manchester educational philanthropists generally, whether this sort of recommendation avails equally with them ; and whether, if they are about to patronize a school system on political grounds at all, they are going to select one which has grown out of democratic institutions, and whose great merit it is that it is adapted to consolidate them ? The common school system of Massachusetts favours a republican government. Is this, we ask, one of its recommendations to the Dean of Manchester, Mr. Entwisle, and Mr. Richson ?

But, even if the end were desirable, let us mark the mode, the only mode, by which it is to be attained. The Massachusetts system is a system of common schools for *all* classes ; and because it is only by the mingling of children of all classes in the same schools on equal terms that the indispensable democratic influence can be arrived at, great pains is taken to make the schools so good that the children of the wealthy may go to them. We ask the admirers of the system whether they are prepared for this ; whether this is the level to which it is their ambition to raise the quality of English elementary schools ; and whether, if they should reach it, they expect that the English aristocracy will send their children to them ? If not, then the influence which New England statesmen rejoice in deriving from their school system must, in Old England, be as unattainable as, in the minds of many at least, it will be undesirable.

In the third place we observe, that in the religious influence of the common schools of Massachusetts there is an actual and acknowledged deficiency, which is only accidentally and imperfectly supplied. This deficiency is expressly admitted by Bishop Eastburn, who, in respect of the school influence being "indirectly favourable to the cultivation of religious sentiments," speaks in very guarded terms. "I think so," says he; and he adds, "a general respect for religion and its institutions would be promoted by that system." We have seen that the system has become much less religious in practice than it is in theory, and that the principles of piety and the practice of morals are, in many instances, but very slenderly inculcated. A glance at the mode in which the acknowledged deficiency is supplied is sufficient to indicate this.

"The agencies" (as Mr. Twisleton has it) by which religious instruction is communicated to the children are, according to Mr. Winthrop, "the pulpit, the Sunday school, and the fire-side." Of the last of these our readers will readily form an estimate for themselves. It is, as Dr. Sears naïvely says, a place where "each family has, *or may have*, its own religious instruction." Doubtless, Dr. Sears, this is cautiously and safely said. The pulpit, of course, is very instructive to those who will go to church. But, the Sunday school! That is the grand panacea for the absence of religious instruction in the common schools.

Formerly in New England, says Mr. Appleton, it was generally the custom for parents, after the church service on Sunday, to instruct their children by hearing them repeat the Lord's prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and to read to them from the Bible and other religious works. This custom is, I am led to believe, to a great extent discontinued; and, as a substitute, it is almost uniformly the case that the various denominations have connected with their society and places of worship Sunday schools.

The system of Sunday schools, says Mr. Hillard, which is universal in New England, is intended to give, and does give, instruction in the tenets of the various religious denominations to which the children respectively belong.

Special religious instruction, says Mr. Ticknor, is communicated in different ways; oftenest and most systematically by Sunday schools.

Every one of the gentlemen with whose opinions we are here favoured writes in the same strain; and even Bishop Eastburn lays particular stress on "the powerful instrumentality of our Sunday schools." Now the Sunday-school is by no means co-eval with the common school. The latter has been in existence two hundred years, the former only thirty. "For the last thirty years," says Mr. Ticknor, "Sunday schools have been increasing in numbers, until now hardly a congregation in New England is without one." Very good. This extensive institution and sedulous cultivation of Sunday schools is a clear proof that they were wanted, and that the common schools were not schools of piety, but that they practically abandoned religious instruction and culture to such chances as might arise.

And to some extent, no doubt, the Sunday schools supply the deficiency of the common school system; but only to some extent.

In the first place, the numbers attending the two classes of schools are not equal. From a return, with which Dr. Sears favoured Mr. Twisleton, of the state of things in six cities and towns of Massachusetts, we derive the following facts:—In Boston, and Lowell, in 36 schools, the children of which range from 7 years of age in the latter place, and 8 in the former, there were in actual attendance when visited 10,961 scholars; and of these

10,057 attended some Sunday school, leaving 904, or one eleventh, who did not do so. In Andover, Fall River, Boxford, and Wayland, in 61 schools, the children of which range from 4 years of age to 16, there were 2,536 scholars; and of these 1970 went to some Sunday-school—leaving 566, or considerably more than one fifth, who did not do so. Dr. Sears endeavours to soften down this state of things, by giving us in his table a column of children who *had* attended some Sunday school, and another of children “not accounted for;” while he suggests many probabilities (more or less plausible) that those who were not at Sunday school were either “too young,” or “too old,” “children of recent immigrants,” or of “Quakers, who are taught at home, of course:” and to cover all other disagreeable appearances, he makes the conclusive observation that “their teachers think that nearly all these children receive instruction at home.” Perhaps they may, Dr. Sears, of more or less value; but this still leaves us the fact, which you are so evidently desirous to cover over, that in Massachusetts, in towns and cities chosen as presenting a fair sample of the whole state, in schools where the children range from 4 to 16, more than one-fifth, or $22\frac{1}{2}$ in every hundred, do not attend Sunday-schools; and in schools where the children range from 7 or 8 to 16, one eleventh, or 9 in every hundred, do not. Applying this rate to the whole community, the number must in the aggregate be very large of children who do not attend Sunday-schools,—that is to say, the number upon whom this principal means of religious instruction for the young can have no influence at all.

In the second place, while there is a very large number upon whom the Sunday school system, whatever be its power, has no possible bearing, we are bold enough to challenge the power of that system itself, as an adequate means of infusing religion into the process of education. Good as the Sunday school is in itself, it has this incidental mischief, that it affords a kind of sanction to the exclusion of religious culture from the weekly school. There being now these recognized means of religious instruction, the common-school teacher has nothing to do but to shift the duty and the responsibility entirely to those admirable and well-qualified parties, and to make his work practically secular. We think this a great evil. Our conviction is, that religion, as a living power, should be in constant application to the heart and conscience of children at school, from the lips, the life, and the discipline of the teacher. One day’s Christianity is, with us, a poor amends for six days’ paganism. The circumstances in which religion should meet children are much more those of active and ordinary life, than the repressed and formal attitude of the Sunday school class. And of the two—supposing the choice to be forced upon us—we should think it a smaller mischief to have no Sunday-school, than to have an active religious culture banished from the day school.

The result which, without actual observation, we can see from this side of the Atlantic, is, we have reason to know, painfully felt on the other. Statesmen may think the common school system of New England “favourable to the cultivation of the religious sentiment and the promotion of morals;” but ministers of religion, and other “observant and calm judging men,” who look at the matter more closely, take a different view. Upon this subject the following statement of Mr. Baines deserves most serious consideration.

1927. Mr. Hugh Seymour Tremenheere, in his Tour in the United States and in Canada, inquired diligently into the effect of the almost entire exclusion of

religious teaching from the schools, and his judgment is strongly against it, as was that of great numbers of clergymen and others whom he consulted, and who regard it as "loosening the hold of definite Christian principle on the minds of the people." Mr. Tremeneere says—"I might multiply the individual opinion of observant and calm judging men, in various parts of the United States, who expressed themselves to me to the same effect; but probably the experience of the gentleman who furnished me with the following statement of his opinions will be sufficient, in addition to what I have stated, to show in how grave a light, and with what apprehensions for the future—apprehensions which have been publicly expressed in terms far stronger than I have thought it necessary to repeat—the present experiment on so momentous a subject as the religious education of the people is considered by large classes of persons in that country. The Rev. Dr. Edson, rector of St. Anne's Church, Lowell, to whom I was directed as thoroughly conversant with this subject, expressed himself to me to the following effect,—'It was twenty-seven years last March since I came to Lowell, which was then a village of about 600 inhabitants. . . Lowell is now a town of about 40,000 inhabitants. I have resided here, as a minister of the episcopal church, ever since, and during the whole time have taken an active part in education, as a member of the school Committee and otherwise. Seeing that the system of public schools established by law was the only one possible under the circumstances of the country, I have applied myself with all the zeal in my power to make it efficient; and I have endeavoured to cause the deficiency of religious instruction in the day schools to be supplied, by encouraging Sunday schools to the utmost of my opportunities. To the children of my own flock I have given all the doctrinal instruction in my power, in the Sunday school and by other means. I have interested myself generally in favour of Sunday schools, seeing in them the only mode, under our system, to imprint on the minds of those who most require such teaching, the principles of revealed religion. My experience, however, of now nearly thirty years as a pastor, has, I am sorry to say, forced upon me the painful conviction, that our public school system has undermined already among our population, to a great extent, the doctrines and principles of Christianity. I perceive also its effects distinctly, in the modes of thought and action of the young people who flow into Lowell from the neighbouring states, and, in fact, supply the demand for labour that is constant here. I find, in my frequent intercourse with them, that they possess a knowledge of none, or nearly none, of the distinctive principles of the Christian faith, and that many are in a state of mind beyond that of mere indifference, though not precisely in that of those imbued with the principles of the French and German schools of infidelity. I find in them a considerable indifference as to what sect they may belong to, thinking all religions alike, and generally showing a great ignorance of the bible which they profess to take as their guide. I find many, not only unable to repeat any of the Ten Commandments, but entirely unaware of there being any Ten Commandments at all. I find them generally well grounded in the ordinary elements of what is called common education, and clear and acute as to all worldly matters that concern them, but very lax in their notions of moral obligation and duty, and indisposed to submit to any authority or control whatever, even from a very early age. This exhibits itself, among other ways, in the irregular manner in which they attend school, Sunday or day school. I have taken much pains with regard to that subject in Lowell; and I have, I am sorry to say, come to the following conclusion:—In the first place we have the Irish population. These are well looked after by their priests, and I have no doubt that nearly the whole of them attend some Sunday or other catechetical instruction. Looking, then, solely at the American population, and the few foreigners not Irish mixed with it, I believe that less than half of the whole number of children between the ages of 5 and 16 attend any Sunday school, or do so most irregularly. It is easy to infer what sort of hold the bible, its precepts, and its doctrines, can be likely to have on minds thus loosely prepared for the temptations of life."

In a subsequent answer Mr. Baines adds to this conclusive testimony of Dr. Edson, (with which Mr. Tremenhoe's own opinion concurs) the following important statement.

1933. Several controversies have existed in New England on this subject. The Episcopalians of New England and New York have long objected to the system. The Presbyterians have formed a board of education, of which the head quarters are at Philadelphia. They insist that 'the influence of a day school is very great, too great to be lost to religious education ;' and they state the principle of their own schools to be, 'religious instruction from the word of God, in connexion with sound intellectual culture.'

To this Mr. Baines might have added, that some other influential religious bodies in the United States have already followed the example of the Presbyterians, and that more are expected shortly to do so. Such is the approaching fate of that vaunted educational institute, which American statesmen declare to be "perfect in theory," and all but perfect in practice ; and which English philanthropists are hurrying to imitate, at the very moment when the wise and the good on the other side of the Atlantic condemn and renounce it.

We now make our way to a fourth observation, namely, that the common school system of the United States is not satisfactory to the whole population, and does not solve the religious difficulty.

This might readily enough be inferred from what lies upon the surface of the system itself. The schools are to inculcate "the principles of piety common to all sorts of Christians," Mr. Winthrop tells us. What then becomes of the Jewish population ? Are their children either to be indoctrinated in lessons from the New Testament, or to be shut out wholly from the advantages of the common school system, paid for equally by all ? So it seems, since no provision for liberty of conscience is made in this respect. And as to the Roman Catholics, is the authorized version to be forced upon them ? According to Dr. Sears, they manifest on this matter a most amiable spirit of compliance. His examination by Mr. Twisleton runs thus :—

Q.—Do the Roman Catholics raise any objection to the presence of their children in the schools when the Bible is read ?

A.—Very rarely. I have known an instance where Roman Catholic parents preferred that their children should enter the school at the close of the morning devotions.

Q.—In the several districts have the Roman Catholics raised any objections to the presence of their children in the schools ?

A.—Not to my knowledge.

The knowledge of Dr. Sears, unfortunately, is too local to be of much service to us. He does not know, it seems, that, in some parts of the Union, although the Roman Catholics have, perhaps, raised no objection to their children being in the schools, they have made strenuous efforts to get the bible out of them, always to the great disquiet of the community, and sometimes with a painfully successful issue. To this effect is the following statement of Mr. Baines.

1929. *Chairman (to Mr. Baines).*—Are the scriptures read in them [the common schools of America] ?

Ans.—They are read in many of them, but from others they are banished ; and it is a matter of complaint by several of the superintendents of the common schools in the state of New York, that they have been unable to prevail upon the local school committees to introduce the scriptures. In some cases

the scriptures have been withdrawn in consequence of the conscientious objections of the Roman catholics to the use of the authorized version.

This is a point on which some members of the Committee evidently needed enlightening. Thus in relation to schools in England the following question was asked.

1816. *Mr. Brotherton (to Mr. Baines).*—You have stated that the Roman Catholics entertain conscientious objections to reading the authorized version of the scriptures. Do you know whether they object to the reading of the authorized version of the scriptures in the United States?

Ans.—I know that in some cases they do, and that they have, in consequence, been the means of the bible being excluded in several schools. In the state of New York the bible has been excluded in consequence of the Roman Catholics objecting to it, and of which the Protestants complain.

1817. Have not the Roman Catholics availed themselves of the schools both in Philadelphia and New York?

Ans.—Yes. They have availed themselves of the schools in several instances in Philadelphia and New York, and they have been the means of excluding the scriptures from some of the schools.

It appears from this statement that the wisdom of the New Englanders has by no means got over the religious difficulty inherent in every system of common schools. Instead of being, as is vaunted, “in theory perfect,” and of providing, as the Hon. Horace Mann assures us it does, for the religious instruction of all classes in combination with a “sacred freedom of conscience,” their system evidently contains the elements of religious discord, and has awakened so strong an opposition on the part of a large and influential portion of the community, that one of its essential features is already disappearing. To import that system into England would do nothing towards allaying religious animosities, or towards associating with a school rate satisfactory guarantees for religious freedom. It would rather be to aggravate the evils of our present position; for, by patient investigation, in which our go-ahead brother Jonathan has certainly not yet rivalled us, we have arrived nearer to a settlement of the vexed question, if settlement there be, than himself.

Fifthly, It may be observed further, that in the New England system of schools there is no unity, either in practice or in theory. On this subject Dr. Sears makes the following statements.

One of the most striking features in our institutions is the existence of our towns (which are equivalent to townships in the north of England) as free corporations; and as in other matters, so also in the management of schools, the greatest degree of freedom is left to these towns, or their Committees, that is consistent with the general unity of the Government.

Again, I wish you to understand that I deem this an essential part of our system, that the [school] control is not exercised by the state authorities, but by the authority of the local committee. Not even the Board of Education have the power of removal [of a faulty teacher], or any direct control over the schools.

It is a very natural consequence of such a state of things, as Dr. Sears intimates, that “a great diversity” should exist, not only as to the mode and quantity of religious instruction, but as to everything else. But what would our Manchester friends say to this? The promoters of the Local bill are for having the school system administered by the municipal authorities, under the controlling influence of the Committee of Council, and they lay great stress on the advantages, and even the necessity, of such control. Why, the New Englanders, and the Americans universally,

would blow their school system into the air, rather than have it made such a channel of government influence, and instrument of aristocratic power. With them the independence of the school Committees is the element which saves the system ; with us such an element would destroy it. It is a sheer imposition to tell us that our Manchester educationists are desirous of transplanting to Old England the common school system of the New.

There is yet room for an additional—a sixth observation. With all their excellency, the common schools of America are very much over-rated.

If the Committee had time to hear it, says Mr. Baines (1938), I could show that their school statistics do not prove what they appear to prove. They do not prove a length of schooling much exceeding that in this country. They [the schools] are extremely irregular in some of the states ; the winter schools in New Hampshire [for example] being kept open only nine and a half weeks upon the average, and the summer schools eight and a half weeks. The schools are taught by women in the summer, and by men in the winter. The teachers then for the most part change their occupations very rapidly. Many of the teachers, it is distinctly stated, do not receive half the wages of the simplest mechanical labourer, notwithstanding there is a splendid and liberal aid in the state of Massachusetts, in the shape of large grants for schools. And yet in this very state of Massachusetts, a female teacher could earn nearly twice as much in the mills, at work in Lowell, as she could as a teacher in the schools.

“It is not all gold that glitters,” says the proverb, and to few things can this proverb be more strikingly applicable than to the New England system of common schools.

On the whole Mr. Baines expresses a final judgment in which we fully agree.

1945. *Mr. Christopher (to Mr. Baines).*—As you would appear, from the evidence you have given, to have had very considerable experience in the manner of instructing children in England, is it your opinion that, if that system were generally adopted in England which has been referred to as being in use in America, namely, the absence of religious education, it would be attended with a beneficial or a demoralizing result ?

Ans.—My opinion is very strong and very solemn, that it would be attended with exceedingly prejudicial results to the religious interests of the people.